

63. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Woman's Club of Williamsport, Pa., urging the modification and revision of our present labor laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 24, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 15, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father in heaven, ere we become involved in the routine of the day, we pause to seek Thy help. Experienced in the ways of men, we know all too little of the ways of God. But Thou knowest us, each one of us, by name and by our needs. Turn our wayward minds and hearts to Thee. Forgive the faults and failures of the past and set us free from them. Forgive, O Lord, our failure to apply to ourselves the standards of conduct we demand of others. Forgive our slowness to see the good in our fellows and to see the evil in ourselves. In our differences may we be kind; in our agreements may we be humble, that Thy will may be done in us, and through us in our beloved land. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 22, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) relating to officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask to be excused from attendance on the Senate on Monday through Wednesday of next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from South Carolina.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR COOLIDGE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, yesterday a former distinguished Member of this body and an honored citizen of Massachusetts passed away. I know every Member of the Senate who served with Marcus Allen Coolidge, of Fitchburg, Mass., liked him. He was a Senator from Massachusetts from 1931 to 1937. Mr. Coolidge, a former mayor of his city, was

held in high respect as a thoughtful, energetic leader in public life. In private life he was a successful businessman and loved by those who worked with him. His family life was always most happy. Born in modest circumstances, by his own enterprise he rose to become one of our prominent citizens. The people of Massachusetts deeply regret his passing.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it was my privilege to succeed the late Marcus A. Coolidge as junior Senator from Massachusetts in January 1937. Consequently, I was in a position to develop an informed judgment on the esteem in which he was held by Senators who had served with him here. His good humor, his wide knowledge of affairs, and his public spirit were qualities which endeared him to his colleagues in the Senate just as they had won for him so many friends in Massachusetts. A fine citizen has gone to his reward. I mourn his passing and extend my warm sympathy to the members of his family.

MEETING OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, subject to the approval of the Senate, I desire to call an organization meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for this afternoon at 2 o'clock in the District of Columbia Committee room, adjacent to the Senate Chamber.

There has been great difficulty in finding a time not in violent conflict with the convenience of many Members in connection with their other duties. Two o'clock this afternoon seems to be about the only time that is available.

The meeting, which is for organization purposes only, will, in my opinion, take not more than 20 minutes. I, therefore, ask permission of the Senate that the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Senate be permitted to attend the meeting at 2 o'clock in the District of Columbia Committee room.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Iowa is granted.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—NOTICE OF SPEECH BY SENATOR MCMAHON

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to notify the Senate that as soon as I can be recognized on Monday I shall deliver an address on the international control of atomic energy.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to acknowledge a letter from the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], announcing the election of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to be members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to serve with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who hold over in their membership upon this committee.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Connor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoev	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Udstead
Eaton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting drafts of a proposed agreement between the United Nations and the United States with reference to arrangements for the permanent headquarters of the United Nations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin, or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year

ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEET AND OPERATING STATEMENTS OF RFC

A letter from the secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting copies of the consolidated balance sheet and operating statements of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries as of June 30, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the National Railway Labor Panel for the period ending March 31, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Resolution 39

"Resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to establish a permanent naval postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.

"Whereas the present training facilities of the United States Navy are inadequate to meet the requirements of the postgraduate training program for officers of the naval service which is designed to preserve and enhance the estimable position of our Navy as the finest and most efficient Navy in the world; and

"Whereas additional naval training facilities for officers must be acquired to provide competent, qualified, and proficient officers in sufficient numbers for the increased strength and size of our postwar Navy; and

"Whereas this assembly in its fifty-sixth session fully endorsed and went on record in favor of the establishment of a permanent naval academy on the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas members of congressional committees which inspected proposed sites for the location of a postgraduate school for the training of naval officers have favored the selection of the Del Monte site, located at Monterey, Calif., which the Navy Department considers best located, suitable, and adaptable to the needs and requirements of the postwar training program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the President of the United States and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States be memorialized to enact, at this session, legislation to establish a permanent postgraduate naval officers' training school on the Monterey Peninsula, at Monterey, State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Navy, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from California."

A resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of California, favoring the enactment of legislation providing sufficient funds to complete all temporary housing units for veterans for which the State of California has appropriated funds to match contributions of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Northwest Public Power Association, an organization composed of cities, public utility districts, and rural electric cooperatives in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, relating to the Foster Creek Dam site on the Columbia River; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the forty-fourth annual meeting of delegates, American Automobile Association, San Francisco, Calif., relating to the national rubber policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the eighth general assembly of the States, at Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to prevent, control, and eradicate hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Evangelicals, Boston, Mass., relating to observance of the Lord's Day; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the president of the National Parks Association, Washington, D. C., praying for the re-establishment of the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D. C., favoring extension of time for availability of funds under the Federal Aid Act of 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D. C., favoring the prompt enactment of legislation relating to the unappropriated balance of \$3,000,000 to finance the improvement of highways across large areas of Federal public lands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D. C., favoring completion of the highway between the United States and the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D. C., relating to the Inter-American highway project; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. McGRATH):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Resolution 554

"Joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to lend their efforts to the fullest capacity to prevent the contemplated scheduled lay-off of employees at the United States naval torpedo station at Newport, R. I.

"Whereas the United States naval torpedo station at Newport, R. I., was established by act of Congress approximately 75 years ago, and is one of the oldest naval institutions in the country; and

"Whereas the contemplated scheduled lay-off of employees at said naval torpedo station will present a serious unemployment problem in a community which has depended for years upon torpedo manufacture as a major industry in the county of Newport; and

"Whereas a large number of the employees at the naval torpedo station have their fam-

ilies and homes in Newport County and many of them are veterans who will thus be thrown out of employment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of the Rhode Island General Assembly protest earnestly and vigorously the decision of the United States Navy Department to reduce the number of employees at the naval torpedo station, at Newport, R. I., directing the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to lend their efforts to the fullest capacity to halt said proceeding and to have said decision reconsidered; directing the secretary of state to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, to Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the so-called Crosser bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AVAILABILITY OF ROAD FUNDS UNDER FEDERAL AID ACT OF 1944

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the South Dakota State Highway Commission in regular session on January 14, 1947, favoring extension of the time for availability of funds under the Federal Aid Act of 1944.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 6009

Extension of time for availability of funds under Federal Aid Act of 1944

Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 authorizes the apportionment of certain funds for each of the first three successive postwar fiscal years for Federal-aid highways, for Federal-aid secondary roads, and for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas; and

Whereas section 4 (d) of said act provides that any sums so apportioned to any State shall be available for expenditure in such State for only 1 year after the close of the fiscal year for which it is apportioned and that any sum so apportioned that remains unexpended at the end of such period, shall lapse and revert to the Treasury of the United States; and

Whereas the aforesaid provisions of section 4 (d) of said act will operate to cause South Dakota to lose that portion of such funds apportioned to it for the first postwar fiscal year that may not be expended by June 30, 1947; and for the second postwar fiscal year not be expended by June 30, 1948; and for the third postwar fiscal year not be expended by June 30, 1949; and

Whereas the South Dakota State Highway Commission is certain that due to the elements of inflation and certain acute shortages of labor and engineering personnel, materials, and equipment, that are known to exist, will make it difficult, if not impossible, to have these funds expended within the time now prescribed by said act, notwithstanding that the State highway commission and the public generally realize that the need for the expenditure of such funds on highway work is and will be more intensified by reason of deterioration, increased unit cost, and ever-mounting traffic volumes; and

Whereas the South Dakota Highway Commission as agent for the counties of South Dakota, which counties, through their privilege, as provided by the afore-mentioned act,

may cooperate with the Federal Government in the construction of Federal-aid secondary farm-to-market roads, is aware of the fact that due to lack of the necessary surveys and plans in the hands of the counties of South Dakota, due to the lack of engineering personnel available to the counties, that unless additional time is provided, as requested herein, the funds made available in the above-mentioned highway act, cannot possibly be used by the counties of South Dakota within the time prescribed: Therefore be it

Resolved by the South Dakota State Highway Commission in regular session on January 14, 1947, That the South Dakota Members in the Congress of the United States are hereby petitioned to use their best efforts in securing an extension of the periods of availability of such funds for 12 months after June 30 of each of the years 1947, 1948, and 1949.

Adopted this 14th day of January A. D. 1947.

SOUTH DAKOTA HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
By FRANK M. MITCHELL,
Secretary.

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the Brotherhood of State Firemen and Oilers, Lodge 618, of America, in which they favor income-tax exemptions of \$2,500 per couple and \$1,000 per dependent.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANDAN, N. DAK., January 23, 1947.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

By unanimous approval, Brotherhood State Firemen and Oilers, Lodge 618, of America favor \$2,500 per couple and \$1,000 per dependent income-tax exemptions.

HARRY M. REYNOLDS,
President.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY (for Mr. McCARTHY):
S. 327. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide for regulation of certain restrictive employment practices; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McGRATH:
S. 328. A bill to provide for daylight saving time in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:
S. 329. A bill for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:
S. 330. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain officers and employees who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 331, to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 332, to provide for the registration of certain firearms, the taxation of the transfers thereof, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 333. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381), as amended, so as to extend the monthly family allowance benefits, and for other purposes; and

S. 334. A bill to establish the Medical Associated Sciences Corps in the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. GURNEY (by request) also introduced Senate bill 335, to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. GURNEY (by request) also introduced Senate bill 336, to provide for the distribution of nonappropriated moneys derived from the operation of officers' clubs, and the distribution and disposal of property, furniture, and fixtures, derived from and by the operation of officers' clubs of the Army Air Forces, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. GURNEY (by request) also introduced Senate bill 337, to amend the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma):

S. 338. A bill to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 339. A bill for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Weil; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 340. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 341. A bill for the relief of Robert Irvin Mobley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 342. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 343. A bill for the relief of Arturo Goncalves Nunes; and

S. 344. A bill for the relief of Manuel Fernandes Pego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 345. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 346. A bill providing for an increase of and continuance of payment of compensation or pension to a child of a deceased World War I or II veteran during education or training; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 347. A bill to grant free postage to veterans being furnished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the amount of personal exemption for income-tax purposes with respect to the taxpayer, and to reduce the amount of such exemption with respect to dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 349. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the

State of South Dakota to Clarence E. Forman; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 350. A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 351. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act to provide for the return of premiums on war-damage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 352. A bill to provide for the reestablishment of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission with the same functions which it had prior to the time Reorganization Plan No. 2 became effective; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. CAPEHART introduced Senate bill 353, to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 354. A bill to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 355. A bill for the relief of E. R. Ensey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 356. A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to audit the accounts of all Government agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS AND DISTRICT COURTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts, and request that a letter from Henry P. Chandler, Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the letter presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 331) to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1947.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In behalf of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, I herewith transmit a bill for an act to supply basic legislative authority for certain personnel of the courts, particularly secre-

aries of circuit and district judges for whom it is now lacking, and I would request that the bill be introduced and enacted in due course.

Provision has been made in the annual appropriation acts for secretaries for circuit and district judges for at least the last 50 years, but there is no other express statutory authority for these employees. During the consideration of the Judiciary Appropriation Act for 1946 in the House of Representatives in the spring of 1945, a point of order was made and sustained to the appropriation for miscellaneous salaries of the courts covering the compensation of the secretaries to judges among other employees. The appropriation was restored during the consideration of the bill in the Senate and this action was concurred in by the House so that the appropriation was included in the 1946 appropriation act for the judiciary as passed. A similar appropriation was made without objection in the appropriation act for the current fiscal year, 1947.

Pursuant, however, to expressions of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses that basic acts should be secured for any purposes included in appropriations for which it was then lacking, consideration was given by members of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges in 1945 to the drafting of legislation to provide for secretaries and law clerks of circuit judges and district judges, and some other miscellaneous employees of the courts paid out of the appropriation for miscellaneous salaries. A bill was recommended which on October 1, 1945, was introduced in the House of Representatives in the last Congress (H. R. 4230). The bill passed the House in the form introduced on March 18, 1946, and on June 14, 1946, passed the Senate with some amendments. The Houses disagreeing, conferees were appointed and a conference report was filed on July 27, 1946, recommending that the House agree to the Senate amendments. This report was agreed to by the Senate but no action was taken on the report in the House and the bill lapsed with the adjournment of the Congress.

The Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges considered the matter again at its annual meeting in October 1946 and recommended the enactment of the bill previously submitted, with the addition of the amendments attached by the Senate. The bill as so amended is now submitted.

The terms of the bill give to the Congress from year to year through the annual appropriation acts complete control of the number and compensation of the judicial employees involved. In this respect the bill follows the pattern of the corresponding provision for clerks and other employees of the executive branch (5 U. S. C. 43). One amendment of substance which was added to the original bill in the Senate extended to the creation of any new position for employees embraced in the bill, a requirement which is applicable under the present law (28 U. S. C. 128) to the appointment of law clerks by district judges, namely that the senior circuit judge of the circuit shall certify to the need for such an employee. This amendment and the formal amendments made by the Senate in the bill the Judicial Conference approved.

It is essential for the effectiveness of the Federal judicial organization that there be no interruption in the secretarial service furnished to the judges and the services rendered to the courts by other personnel now appropriated for. I, therefore, hope that the enclosed bill may receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Yours very respectfully,

HENRY P. CHANDLER,

NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT OF 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of Justice, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to be known

as the National Firearms Act of 1947, for the registration of firearms in our country, and for a tax on their transfer.

POSSIBLE OBJECTIONS TO BILL

In the past some objections have been raised to the registration of firearms in our country. I believe that these objections should be adequately heard, but that prompt action should be taken in consideration of legislation such as that I am introducing.

Question may be raised as to the constitutionality of the proposed legislation. In this connection, we might note that the constitutionality of the National Firearms Act of 1934 was sustained as an exercise of the taxing power of Congress.

I am not committed to the language of this proposed bill as final, but I am anxious that a measure of this type should be thoroughly and quickly evaluated by Congress.

I would be the very last person to suggest that the Federal Government intrude on any matter pertaining exclusively to our State governments and localities. But the problem of crime is a Nation-wide problem, and the responsibility of the National Government is great. I point out, too, that nothing in the proposed legislation will impair the right of any State or locality to pass its own laws which might regulate the carrying of concealed weapons or the licensing of traffic in firearms.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The situation to which the Attorney General calls attention in his letter to me regarding the vast unaccounted-for amount of firearms in our country, which is contributing to the present crime wave, must, I believe, be promptly corrected. Right now we require registration and tax the transfer of machine guns, sub-machine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and silencers, but do not require registration of nor do we tax the transfer of pistols, rifles, semiautomatic rifles, or ordinary rifles. The headlines in every paper telling us of new crimes demand that we consider some action on the latter group of deadly weapons.

It will be noted that the proposed legislation exempts from these requirements all shotguns and all rifles with a caliber of .22 or smaller, firing rim-fire ammunition, unless they are already covered by the provisions of the National Firearms Act. Firearms of these calibers are generally used for sporting purposes and, therefore, need not come within the purpose of the proposed legislation.

I believe that the vast group of hunting sportsmen in our country will be the very first to recognize the necessity for curbing conditions which lead to the very unsportsmanlike use of firearms in crime. Countless parents throughout the country, too, who are concerned with the problem of juvenile delinquency, will recognize that some such legislation as this may prove very important in preventing their own youth and other youth from securing firearms and entering into a wayward life of crime.

I ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks and that a letter to me from the Attorney General on this subject also be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 332) to provide for the registration of certain firearms, the taxation of the transfers thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "firearm" means any firearm from which a shot is discharged by an explosive, other than firearms included within the provisions of the act of June 26, 1934, known as the National Firearms Act, but does not include any rifle designed to fire rim fire ammunition, the caliber of which is .22 or smaller, or any shotgun.

(b) The term "person" includes a partnership, association, or corporation, as well as a natural person.

(c) The term "importer" means any person who imports or brings firearms into the United States for sale.

(d) The term "manufacturer" means any person who is engaged within the United States in the manufacture of firearms, or who otherwise produces therein any firearm for sale or disposition.

(e) The term "dealer" means any person, other than a manufacturer or importer, engaged within the United States in the business of selling firearms. The term "dealer" shall include wholesalers, pawnbrokers, and dealers in used firearms.

(f) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

(g) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(h) The term "to transfer" shall include to sell, assign, pledge, lease, loan, give away, or otherwise dispose of.

SEC. 2. (a) Within 60 days after the effective date of this act, or upon first engaging in business, every importer, manufacturer, and dealer in firearms shall register with the collector of internal revenue for each district in which such business is to be carried on, his name or style, principal place of business, and places of business in such district, and pay a special tax at the following rates: Importers or manufacturers, \$100 a year; dealers, \$5 a year.

(b) Whenever any tax imposed by this section accrues at any time other than the 1st day of July in any year, it shall be computed proportionately from the 1st day of the month in which the liability to the tax accrued to the 1st day of July following.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person required to register under the provisions of this section to import, manufacture, or deal in firearms without having registered or paid the tax imposed by this section.

The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person in any year who has paid for such year a tax imposed by section 2 of the act of June 26, 1934, known as the National Firearms Act.

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be levied, collected, and paid upon every transfer of any firearm a tax at the rate of \$1. Such tax shall be paid by the transferor and shall be represented by appropriate stamps to be provided by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary. The stamps herein provided shall be affixed to the order for such firearms, hereinafter referred to. The tax imposed by this section shall be in addition to any import duty imposed on such firearm.

(b) All provisions of law (including those relating to special taxes; to the assessment, collection, remission, and refund of internal-revenue taxes; to the engraving, issuance, safety, accountability, cancellation, and distribution of tax-paid stamps provided for

in the internal-revenue laws, and to penalties) applicable with respect to the taxes imposed by section 1 of the act of December 17, 1914, as amended (U. S. Code, title 26, secs. 2550 and 3220), and all other provisions of the internal-revenue laws shall, insofar as not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, be applicable with respect to the taxes imposed by this act.

(c) Under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe, and upon proof of the exportation of any firearm to any foreign country (whether exported as part of another article or not) with respect to which the transfer tax upon this section has been paid by the manufacturer, the Commissioner shall refund to the manufacturer the amount of the tax so paid, or, if the manufacturer waives all claim for the amount to be refunded, the refund shall be made to the exporter.

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to transfer a firearm except in pursuance of a written order from the person seeking to obtain such article, on an application form issued in blank in triplicate for that purpose by the Commissioner, which order shall identify the transferee by such means as may be prescribed by regulations under this act. If the transferee is an individual, such identification shall include his fingerprints. Copies of the application and fingerprints shall be transmitted forthwith by the Commissioner to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) Every person transferring a firearm shall set forth in each copy of such order the manufacturer's number or other mark identifying such firearm and shall forward such order in duplicate to the Commissioner. The original thereof, with stamps affixed, shall be returned to the transferor for delivery to the transferee.

(c) If the transfer of a firearm is exempted from the provisions of this act as provided in section 11 hereof, the person transferring such firearm shall notify the Commissioner of the name and address of the transferee, the number or other mark identifying such firearm, and the date of its transfer, and shall file with the Commissioner such documents in proof thereof as the Commissioner may by regulations prescribe. Copies of the aforesaid notification and accompanying documents shall be transmitted forthwith by the Commissioner to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(d) Importers, manufacturers, and dealers who have registered and paid the tax as provided for in section 2 of this act shall not be required to conform to the provisions of this section with respect to transactions in firearms with dealers or manufacturers who likewise have registered and have paid such tax, but shall keep such records and make such reports regarding such transactions as may be prescribed by regulations under this act.

SEC. 5. (a) Within 6 months after the effective date of this act every person possessing a firearm shall register, with the collector of internal revenue for the district in which he resides, the number or other mark identifying such firearm, together with his name, address, place where such firearm is usually kept, and place of business or employment, and, if such person is other than a natural person, the name and home address of an executive thereof. If the applicant for registration is an individual, the application for registration shall include his fingerprints. No person shall be required to register under this subsection with respect to any such firearm acquired after the effective date of this act and in conformity with the provisions thereof. Copies of the aforesaid registrations and fingerprints shall be transmitted forthwith by the Commissioner to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) The residence of a person possessing a firearm in violation of this act shall be presumed to be the place where the firearm shall

be discovered or seized, but this presumption shall be rebuttable.

SEC. 6. It shall be unlawful for any person to receive or possess any firearm which has been transferred to him in violation of section 3 or 4 of this act. Whenever on trial for a violation of this section the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of such firearm at any time after the expiration of the period prescribed for registration by section 5 (a), without having registered the same as required by section 5, such possession shall create a presumption that such firearm came into the possession of the defendant subsequently to the expiration of such period, but this presumption shall be rebuttable.

SEC. 7. (a) Any firearm which has at any time been transferred in violation of the provisions of this act shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture, and (except as provided in subsection (b)) all the provisions of internal revenue laws relating to searches, seizure, and forfeitures of unstamped articles are extended to and made to apply to the articles taxed under this act and the persons to whom this act applies.

(b) In the case of the forfeiture of any firearm by reason of a violation of this act, no such firearm shall be sold at public sale. If such firearm is in the possession of any officer of the United States other than the Secretary, such officer shall deliver the firearm to the Secretary; and the Secretary may order such firearm destroyed or may sell such firearm to any State, Territory, or possession, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or retain it for the use of the Treasury Department or transfer it without charge to any other executive department or any independent establishment of the Government for use by it.

SEC. 8. (a) Each manufacturer and importer of a firearm shall identify it with a number or other identification mark approved by the Commissioner, such number or mark to be stamped or otherwise placed thereon in a manner approved by the Commissioner.

(b) It shall be unlawful for anyone to obliterate, remove, change, or alter such numbers or other identification mark. Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of any firearm upon which such number or mark has been obliterated, removed, changed, or altered, such possession shall create a presumption that the defendant obliterated, changed, or altered such number or other identification mark, but such presumption shall be rebuttable.

SEC. 9. Importers, manufacturers, and dealers, shall keep such books and records and render such returns in relation to the transactions in firearms specified in this act as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations require.

SEC. 10. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary for carrying the provisions of this act into effect; and shall cause suitable forms to be prepared for the purposes of this act, and to be distributed to collectors of internal revenue and such other persons as he shall determine.

(b) The Postmaster General is hereby authorized to accord the use of the facilities of the Post Office Department for the distribution of registration forms required of this act.

(c) The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall investigate violations of this act and shall have access to the files and records of the Commissioner relating to the administration of the act.

SEC. 11. This act shall not apply (1) to transfers of firearms to the United States; or to any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof; or to the District of Columbia; (2) to transfers of firearms to any peace officer or

any officer or employee of the United States, designated by regulations of the Commissioner; or (3) to transfers of any firearms which are unserviceable and which are transferred as a curiosity or ornament. The provisions of section 5 of this act shall not apply to any transfer referred to in clauses (1) or (2) of this section.

SEC. 12. Any person who violates or fails to comply with any provision of sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, or 9 of this act shall be fined not more than \$500 or be imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 13. The provisions of this act shall apply to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Alaska, and the Territory of Hawaii.

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 15. This act shall become effective 90 days after the date of its approval.

SEC. 16. This act may be cited as the "National Firearms Act of 1947."

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1947.
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I desire to bring to the attention of the Congress an important problem arising out of the traffic in firearms.

One of the principal difficulties confronting law enforcement agencies is the comparative ease with which criminals procure deadly weapons. Recent developments have accentuated this condition. At present, thousands of small arms, principally revolvers and automatic pistols, originally issued to the members of the armed forces, are in the possession of persons who do not appear to have acquired them legitimately. This situation is, in part, due to the fact that prior to August 6, 1940, the War Department authorized the sale of such weapons to officers of the Army and Navy and the Marine Corps, to officers of the Reserve Corps, to members of the National Guard, and to members of the National Rifle Association. While one of the conditions of these sales was that the firearms were not transferable, nevertheless, a great many of them were sold by original purchasers and changed hands many times.

During World War II, thousands of firearms have been brought into the United States by soldiers returning from abroad, or have been stolen from various units of the armed forces within the United States and from National Guard armories. Moreover, the armed forces have reported that a tremendous number of small arms have been lost or unaccounted for. For example, between November 1941 and December 1944, the War and Navy Departments have submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation over 1,300 reports of losses of firearms, such as revolvers, automatic pistols, machine guns, rifles, and the like. Recently a considerable number of various types of firearms, frequently of foreign origin, have been found in the possession of members of the underworld. Investigation has shown that many of these weapons have been smuggled into the United States, either by returning soldiers and sailors or by merchant seamen on return voyages from foreign countries, and eventually have found their way into illicit channels. These conditions constitute a potential menace and danger, and may lead to an increase in crime. The problem is Nation-wide in character, and adequately can be attacked only on a national basis.

At present, there are two Federal statutes partially regulating and limiting traffic in firearms. The first is the National Firearms Act (act of June 26, 1934, 48 Stat. 1237; 26 U. S. C. 2720-2733). This statute relates to machine guns, submachine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and silencers. This act imposed a tax on all transfers of firearms of the foregoing type. It also required all persons possessing such firearms to register them with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. In addition, the act imposed a tax on importers, manufacturers of, and dealers in such firearms. The constitutionality of this act, as an exercise of the taxing power of Congress, was sustained in *Sonzinski v. United States* (300 U. S. 506), and *United States v. Miller* (307 U. S. 174). Experience has shown that the act is exceedingly effective within its sphere. Nevertheless, the fact that its scope is restricted to firearms of specified limited types and does not reach such weapons as pistols, rifles, semiautomatic rifles, ordinary rifles, and shotguns, renders it inadequate.

The Federal Firearms Act (act of June 30, 1938, 52 Stat. 1250; 15 U. S. C. 901-909) relates to interstate and foreign commerce in firearms. It created a license system in respect to manufacturers and dealers who transport, ship, or receive firearms or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce. In addition, it prohibits the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of any firearms by any person who is known to be under indictment or as having been convicted in any Federal or State court of a crime of violence, or is known to be a fugitive from justice. It is made unlawful for any such person to ship, transport, or cause to be shipped or transported, any firearm or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce. This act does not solve the problem confronting law enforcement agencies in view of the fact that it is based upon the commerce clause and, therefore, is confined to transactions in interstate or foreign commerce. This circumstance renders the act inapplicable to numerous situations involving improper possession and use of firearms.

I recommend enactment of legislation requiring the general registration of firearms and the levying of a tax on the transfer of such firearms in the United States. I would, however, exempt from these requirements all shotguns and rifles with a caliber of .22 or smaller designed to fire rim-fire ammunition, unless they are already covered by the provisions of the National Firearms Act of June 26, 1934. Firearms of these calibers are used for sporting purposes and would seem not ordinarily to come within the purposes of the proposed legislation.

The result to be achieved can be accomplished by extending the scheme of the National Firearms Act. The application for registration and the record of the transfer should be accompanied by the fingerprints of the applicant. Copies of such fingerprints should be transmitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In addition, all importers, manufacturers, and dealers in firearms should be required to register and pay a tax. In order not to impose an undue financial burden on owners of firearms, I suggest that the tax on transfers of firearms be fixed at only \$1.

The proposed legislation would result in a record of firearms in the United States and would make it possible to observe traffic in and the flow of firearms. Persons failing to comply with the requirements of the act would be subject to criminal penalties. The measure would place difficulties in the way of organized gangsters who may endeavor to equip themselves with firearms for the purpose of carrying on their criminal activities. It would make it more difficult for dealers to engage in illicit transactions in firearms. In addition, it would afford law enforcement agencies an effective means of tracing sources of supply and of detecting dealers who furnish firearms to criminals,

as well as assisting in the identification of specific weapons.

For some years this Department has urged the enactment of legislation of the type here proposed. Because of the conditions described above, the necessity for it is even greater at this time than it has been heretofore.

Attention is called to the fact that the proposed legislation would not require a person purchasing or possessing a firearm to procure a license. It would merely require him to register the firearm and to record any transfer of the weapon. The burden imposed upon a law-abiding citizen who desires to possess a firearm would be inconsequential. It would be no greater than that involved in the registration of an automobile. Yet, laws requiring the registration of automobiles have never been regarded as unduly onerous. Registration of deadly weapons is at least as necessary as the registration of motor vehicles.

Nothing in the proposed legislation would impair the right of a State or local subdivision to pass laws regulating the carrying of concealed weapons or the licensing of traffic in firearms.

A draft of a proposed bill to effectuate this recommendation is enclosed. I urge its enactment.

I have been informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

NATIONAL AIR CORPS RESERVE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, by request of the National Air Corps Reserve of the United States, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference three bills. This organization held a convention in Memphis, Tenn., in November, and adopted certain resolutions outlining their ideas respecting the Air Corps Reserve and setting forth how it should be established. I believe Congress should have the benefit of their ideas. I certainly should like to have them fully explored.

There being no objection, the bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 335. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training;

S. 336. A bill to provide for the distribution of nonappropriated moneys derived from the operation of officers clubs, and the distribution and disposal of property, furniture and fixtures, derived from and by the operation of officers clubs of the Army Air Forces; and

S. 337. A bill to amend the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended.

PROHIBITION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF FLAMMABLE WEARING APPAREL AND FABRICS

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 353) to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals,

and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I had intended to make on the floor of the Senate may now be printed in the body of the RECORD in order to save time. The statement deals with the bill I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

Mr. President, I have introduced today a bill that I feel confident will attract the immediate attention of every Member of the Senate.

I am sure all Senators read some months ago of the several deaths that resulted right here in the Washington area when children wearing so-called cowboy suits were fatally burned when their clothing became ignited. I do not know how many deaths have been caused throughout the country in the past several years by flammable garments, but I do know that from a preliminary survey the situation demands our immediate attention. Hence, I have introduced a bill that I believe it will be agreed is the type of legislation that is needed.

This bill has been drafted after nearly 2 years of study by the best technical minds in the country. Committees of the National Retail Dry Goods Association and the American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists working in conjunction with manufacturers, processors, finishers, and retailers, have drafted a bill that will, I believe, cope adequately with the problem. I am happy to sponsor it here. Certainly the purpose of this measure is in the highest public interests, for it will rid the market place of dangerous wearing apparel.

That this problem is not confined to children's play suits, let me give a few examples of what is happening:

A Chicago woman was severely burned when a pair of slacks she was wearing ignited when she struck a match. Even the furniture in her apartment was damaged by the flames.

Here in Washington a woman received serious burns when the chenille lounging robe she was wearing caught fire and burned rapidly.

Last March in Berlin, N. H., a young expectant mother died 3 days after being critically burned when her clothes became ignited as she was preparing dinner. An apron she was wearing caught fire, turning her into a mass of flames.

An 18-year-old Texas co-ed died from burns that resulted when her dress caught fire at a sorority initiation. On and on go these horror stories. I cite these cases for you in order that you may realize the seriousness of this problem of flammable wearing apparel.

The bill I introduce is the culmination of long months of study on the part of the best technical minds in the country.

Briefly, this bill would prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals. It covers not only garments and piece goods, but also articles of personal adornment such as bracelets, buttons, brooches, and similar items. The administration of this measure would come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, an agency well qualified through experience in this general field to administer such an act.

Although I have always been, and still am, a staunch supporter of State rights, I believe in this instance that a Federal measure is the only solution to the problem. At the present

time, California has on its statute books an act that has for its purpose the control of flammable wearing apparel, and I am informed that no less than 23 other States are studying the problem with a view toward enacting similar legislation. If this were to happen, it would result in an impossible situation for manufacturers and finishers of this type of merchandise. I think it goes without saying that there would be no uniformity among the States and that manufacturers would be placed in the position of trying to conform with 24 different regulations. For this reason, I believe a strong, but fair national statute is the only solution to this problem. In fact, I am advised that the California Legislature is watching with a great deal of interest the progress of this bill, and for the sake of uniformity may withhold the effective date of their measure until the Federal act becomes operative.

Let me say in closing that this bill is supported by the National Retail Dry Goods Association, an association of 7,000 department stores, and by the American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists, as well as others interested in this problem. All are acting unselfishly in an effort to protect the useless waste of lives that has resulted from the manufacture and sale of wearing apparel made from flammable materials. Because of the urgency of the situation, I recommend that this bill be given serious consideration and attention.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] asked to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech which he would have delivered if he had had an opportunity to do so this afternoon. I am not objecting to this speech being printed in the RECORD today, but I wish to say that it is highly irregular to have speeches printed in the body of the RECORD unless they have been delivered on the floor of the Senate. I can recall one instance in which the printing of a speech in the body of the RECORD when it was not delivered on the floor contributed to the defeat of a Senator in the election which followed soon after.

It seems to me that we should not permit any more speeches to be printed in the body of the RECORD unless they are delivered on the floor of the Senate, because there might be something in such speeches to which other Senators would like to take exception, which they would not have an opportunity to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say to the Senator from Vermont that the statement of the Senator from Indiana will be printed in small type, and not in the regular type. It is in the nature of a statement, and not a speech.

Mr. AIKEN. That is perfectly proper, as I understand; but I merely heard the request to have the speech printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not construe the request as the Senator from Vermont construed it. Otherwise the Chair would not have given his own consent.

POSTPONEMENT OF REDUCTION OF DUTIES UNDER RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution requesting the post-

ponement of further reduction of duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the resolution just submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] for himself and the senior Senator from Nevada is, I think, of sufficient importance to be brought to the immediate attention of the Senate. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which is very brief, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 69), submitted by Mr. DWORSHAK (for himself and Mr. McCARRAN), was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the President and all agencies of the Federal Government are hereby requested to postpone any action seeking the further reduction of duties under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act), as amended, until sufficient time has elapsed to permit (1) a complete study by the Committee on Finance of the necessity for further action under the reciprocal trade agreements policy, and (2) action by the Congress with respect to any legislation proposed by such committee as the result of such study.

GENERAL SURVEY OF CONDITION OF AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed, during the Eightieth Congress, to exercise the authority conferred and perform the duties imposed upon the Committee on Indian Affairs by Senate Resolution 79, agreed to February 2, 1928, and continued by subsequent resolutions, to make a general survey of the condition of the Indians in the United States.

The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, out of funds heretofore authorized by the Senate for such study by the Committee on Indian Affairs, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES IN CONNECTION WITH NONTAXABLE GOVERNMENT-OWNED LAND

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 71), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Public Lands, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the burdens imposed upon the States, and political subdivisions thereof, by reason of the location within their boundaries of real property of the United States which is not subject to State and local taxation, and with respect to the extent, if any, to which the United States should contribute to the financial support of the governments of the States, and political subdivisions thereof, in which such real property is located.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. MILLIKIN, the Committee on Finance was discharged from

the further consideration of the following bills, and they were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 112. A bill to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; and

S. 118. A bill to guarantee honorably discharged veterans their right to work regardless of whether they are members or non-members of any labor organization.

On motion of Mr. MILLIKIN, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 304) to provide for the redemption of terminal-leave bonds by the use of any surplus of Federal receipts over Federal expenditures, and it was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Under authority of Senate Resolution 55, agreed to January 17, 1947, the Secretary, on January 23, 1947, presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) relating to officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SETTLEMENT OF GREAT SALT LAKE VALLEY—HYMN OF THE PIONEER

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, this is 1947. On July 24, 1847, the Mormon pioneers entered the Great Salt Lake Valley to make their home. The one hundredth anniversary of this event will be recognized by community and State-wide celebrations throughout this centennial year.

In 1909 the Grand Army of the Republic held its annual national encampment in Salt Lake City. In order that the Civil War veterans might catch the spirit which directed the hearts and the purposes of the Utah pioneers, Kate Thomas wrote the Hymn of the Pioneer. This poem reflects an idealization of the hope which inspired the hearts and the minds of the founders of Utah. Because of the Nation-wide interest in this year's celebration, I deem it not out of place to ask unanimous consent that the poem be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HYMN OF THE PIONEER

(By Kate Thomas)

Courage, my soul! All is not barren plain.
What tho' the way be long and strewed
with dead.
His word is sure who knoweth all thy pain.
Lift up thine eyes, His heaven is overhead.
Praise God! Praise God!
His sun broke thro' the night
On—on—press on—
His love is all His might.
Courage, my soul! Yon is the Promised Land.
There shall white winter make thee no
more cold;
There shalt thou rest thee of the burning
sand;
Sweet streams shall lave thee, smiling
dreams enfold.
Praise God! Praise God!
Deem not the conquest vain.
On—on—press on—
Thy sorrow is thy gain.

Courage, my soul! The Promised Land is drear?

Still fruitless desert, bitter, burning sun?
Still must thy back bend to a task severe?
Lift up thine eyes! Thy glory is begun.

Praise God! Praise God!
Thy burden is thy crown,
On—on—press on—
Nor stoop to lay it down.

Praise God, my soul! Behold the desert flowers.

Nations and tongues and peoples turn their feet
Towards a fair land, made fair by weary hours.

Lift up thine eyes! Thy triumph is complete.

Praise God! Praise God!
His love makes trial light.
On—on—press on—
The Promised Land is bright!

Praise God, my soul! My children reap the seed

Sowed by my faith and watered by my tears.

God of the nations, God of every creed,
Let them be just to what my soul reveres!

Praise God! Praise God!
Omnipotent above!
On—on—press on—
Till all the world is love!

INADEQUACY OF TEACHERS' SALARIES— SERMON BY DR. J. WARREN HASTINGS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some time ago I introduced a bill which is now pending before a committee of this body looking toward assistance from the Federal Government to the teachers of America. Just a few days ago a sermon was delivered by the Reverend Dr. J. Warren Hastings, minister, National City Christian Church of Washington, D. C., in which, among other things, he said:

The situation is tragic. Public-school teachers are leaving the teaching profession in droves. The average school-teacher salary in 1941 was \$1,470. The average salary for lawyers in independent practice for the same year was \$4,794. Birth-rate statistics, the highest on record in our history, indicate that the public school now, and in the next 20 years, is more important to the preservation and dissemination of our democratic ideals than ever before in our history.

The sermon is so illuminating and apt to the subject, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALLED TO TEACH

"And He gave some teachers * * * for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." (Ephesians 4: 11, 12.)

Jesus believed in teaching. To Him life evolved around the twin principles of teaching and learning. He who had knowledge taught, and the uninformed learned. That was, and is, the way life progresses. Jesus picked up a little child and said: "Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child shall in nowise enter therein." He would begin teaching children at a younger age than we do in our public schools.

COLONIAL EDUCATION FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES

There is no greater responsibility than that of awakening the personality of another person, of trying to direct his footsteps along the right pathway. To the Pilgrim Fathers, following the basic tenets of religion to the best of their ability, teaching was the main

undergirt of their religion. In the beginning of the life of the colony, the children gathered in the kitchen of one of the village homes. Here they were taught from the Hornbook. One learned his letters, and so to read, in order to be able to study the Bible. A stands for Adam who sinned in the fall, and then they had what B stands for and C, etc.

Religion and education were closely allied in early America. The mind was to be informed and quickened and character was to be formed. Horace Mann (1796-1859) contended that just so far and so fast as education is extended, true democracy is ascendant. He believed that proper teaching would awaken an individual personality. Jesus would agree with that position.

Our first universities were founded by the Church. Harvard College, William and Mary College, King's College (now Columbia), Yale—all stemmed from religious sources.

PUBLIC SCHOOL THE FOUNDATION OF DEMOCRACY

The sociologists tell us that the world can be completely changed in three generations if people are taught correctly. Believing in public education as we do, we are prone to say: "Well, let the school do the proper job and be done with this terribly slow process of kingdom building." But that is not happening, for our public-school system is suffering from many ills. Admittedly the public schools are of the very warp and woof of America but at this moment they are ailing.

Most of us are products of the public-school system. The melting-pot experience which Zangwill talked about, and which is a vital, fundamental part of American life, took place in the public school. The children of the poor sat by and fellowshipped with the children of the rich. Clean and unclean played together until the teacher helped the unclean to be otherwise. The youngster who was not too brilliant had a degree of fellowship with the boy who had a high I. Q. The thing that made democracy was the fact that boys and girls from all sorts of homes and backgrounds could come together in a give-and-take, fair, and sportsmanship experience. This was the public-school system.

Where did you first learn your ideas of democracy? In the public schools. Where did you first learn the meaning of the Stars and Stripes and have a loyalty for the flag? In the public schools. Where did you first learn that "a man's a man for a' that"? In the public schools. Where did you first learn that a foreigner could come to our shores, learn our way of life, seek and secure citizenship, and then be one of us? In the public schools.

Recall these lines from the Ballad for Americans: "I'm just an Irish, Negro, Jewish, Italian, French and English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Polish, Scotch, Hungarian, Litvak, Swedish, Finnish, Canadian, Greek and Turk, and Czech and double Czech American. And that ain't all. I was baptized Baptist, Methodist, Congregationalist, Lutheran, Atheist, Roman Catholic, Orthodox Jewish, Presbyterian, Seventh-Day Adventist, Mormon, Quaker, Christian Scientist, and lots more."

TODAY'S TRAGIC DECLINE IN PUBLIC-SCHOOL SYSTEM

Something strange has happened to us. The public-school system which was the Nation's melting pot and which really made democracy possible is waning. The public schools can do more to mold the people of this Nation together than any other of our institutions, but it cannot be the vital factor for building America that it might be without our support. Since 1939, 350,000 public-school teachers have quit. Nine hundred thousand teachers are required to staff our schools. It has been impossible to replace many of the teachers who have turned

elsewhere for employment, with the result that our schools are at present understaffed.

There are 5,000,000 children of school age in this country who are not in school. In one State 36 percent of the people have not been to school more than 4 years. Most people seem to care very little about these deplorable conditions.

It will shock you to learn that there are 10,000,000 illiterate people in the United States. The United States Army turned down 676,000 for educational deficiency. Three hundred and fifty thousand of them could sign only an X for their names. Even in the Nation's capital city we have a fraction less than 9 percent illiterate.

There is a strange decline in educational emphasis so far as the public schools are concerned. Those who have entered the teaching profession in the last few years have 1 year less preparation than did the group beginning to teach in 1940 and in the years immediately prior to it. In 1920 22 percent of the students in our institutions of higher learning were preparing to teach. What percent today? Seven percent. There are almost 800,000 GI's studying today in our colleges and universities; less than 18,000 of them are preparing to teach. Yet the public schools are the very foundation of our democracy.

What do you think is the average educational level in the United States? The ninth grade, that is the first year of high school.

The situation is tragic. Public-school teachers are leaving the teaching profession in droves. The average teacher salary in 1941 was \$1,470. The average salary for lawyers in independent practice for the same year was \$4,794. Birthrate statistics, the highest on record in our history, indicate that the public-school teacher now and in the next 20 years is more important to the preservation and dissemination of our democratic ideals than ever before in our history.

SOME ANSWERS TO THE PROBLEM

What can we do about this situation? I trust that some of you who have left teaching will return to the profession. A former high-school teacher sat in my office not long ago and said: "You know, I often get homesick for the classroom, but I am making several hundred dollars a year more working for the Government than I can teaching school." Exactly so. And there are thousands in the same category.

How can you produce character unless you do it with people early in their lives? You are a churchman. When did you get the roots of your character? Did your mother bring you up to do as you pleased until you were 25 and then tell you to decide for yourself what your character would be? She did not.

Many of you received your early education in one- or two-room schoolhouses, and it was in them that your character was bent in the right direction. Today there are 9,000,000 school children living in the country areas of this land. Their teachers are the poorest paid of all public-school teachers. More than 40,000 of them get less than \$600 for their year's work.

The people who played a major part in building character in my life were public-school teachers—Miss Dare in the fourth grade; Miss Baker, the strict disciplinarian, in the sixth grade; and Miss King in the eighth grade—to mention a few of them. Miss King was in her late fifties or early sixties when it was my privilege to sit under her. She had white hair and she was as straight as an arrow. The memory of her is an inspiration to me to this day. The very heart of my boyhood was my public-school experience.

The public-school system and all that it means was part of the religious life of this Nation. We were putting into practice the

philosophy of Jesus, which was that in every personality there were tremendous potential possibilities. The only way those potential powers could be awakened and aroused was for the teacher to brood over the pupil and thus bring out the best there was in him. That is true today. This principle lies at the heart of the existence of our democracy.

You say it costs too much to have an adequate public-school system. Bear in mind the fact that we spend five times as much in the segregation and rehabilitation of our criminal group, which is about 2 percent of our population, than we do on public education for our children. As Horace Mann said: "If you do not improve the schools you must enlarge the prisons."

We spent billions for military equipment, training men to fight, and for war. It is not asking too much to ask that the public-school system be adequately and properly financed.

Every well-meaning citizen of this land has a responsibility in this matter. Let us awaken from our long sleep and do something about it. Let us do our utmost to give to posterity the kind of government which we call democracy. Only by everyone having some part in this effort can our labors meet with success.

CONDITIONS IN JAPAN—ARTICLE FROM NEWSWEEK

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in the January 27 issue of Newsweek, which is on the news stands today, there appears a very thought-provoking report by a reporter respecting the general economic situation in Japan in connection with our administration of that government. The article is entitled "Behind the Japanese Purge—American Military Rivalries." I ask that this short news story may be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND THE JAPANESE PURGE—AMERICAN MILITARY RIVALRIES

"All I can do now is make a good black-market connection or join the Communist Party."

That was what a typical Japanese businessman last week told Compton Pakenham, chief of Newsweek's Tokyo bureau. He was bewildered. Some 25,000 to 30,000 of his nation's businessmen, financiers, and industrialists faced removal from their jobs. Furthermore, all their relatives to the third degree were also forbidden to hold such posts, thus making a total of 250,000 victims. In effect, the brains of the entire Japanese economic structure were being removed. The inevitable result—to turn Japanese economic life over to shinyen (new yen) millionaires, black marketeers, and speculators. The extreme left could capitalize on such a situation to the advantage of the ever-watchful Russians, the advocates of severe purges.

The Japanese businessman was bewildered because these things were being done under the orders of the only remaining great capitalist power, the United States. The original purge directive had been issued by General of the Army MacArthur, and was largely used for a political house cleaning. But now the economic application of the purge cuts off the most active, efficient, experienced, cultured, and cosmopolitan section of the nation—the very section that has always been the best disposed toward cooperation with the United States. These classes consider that they helped make the occupation one in which the United States has been able to reduce its occupying forces to a minimum because resistance to them has been practi-

cally nil. Now these Japanese are concerned about the growth of a possible underground with Soviet connections.

Many occupation officers on all levels shared the bewilderment of the Japs. Some felt that instead of pressing for an investigation in Germany, Congress should send a committee to Japan to discover why American capitalist principles are being undermined by American occupation authorities.

They felt that such an investigation would help clear General MacArthur of any blame and would repair the damage already inflicted on his dignity in the eyes of the Japanese. Finally, these officers believed that only a congressional investigator could clear up the mystery of American occupation policy.

Insofar as could be ascertained by Newsweek's sources, this was what lay behind the current purge: The original purge order was issued on January 4, 1946, by General MacArthur. Theoretically it was designed to eliminate from Japanese life those who had aided militarism and plans of conquest. On November 21, 1946, and January 4, 1947, MacArthur's original directive was deepened and broadened in the economic field by Japanese ordinances. Because of the structure of Japanese business this worked out as would a similar order in the United States purging all businessmen who contributed to the war effort and members of the National Association of Manufacturers. It was thus nearly all-inclusive, unlike denazification in Germany which has a specifically political basis. It was given to the Japanese Government to implement but its execution was closely supervised by occupation authorities.

A HOUSE DIVIDED

The purge originated in the military government branch of the occupation. This branch has long been involved in a four-cornere fight for authority with the G-2 section of Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, the economic and scientific section of Maj. Gen. William F. Marquat, and the civilian information and education section under Lt. Col. Donald R. Nugent. The relations between these four sections of military government have progressively degenerated as their aims and methods diverged.

Both Willoughby and Marquat are professional soldiers accustomed to operating through channels. They therefore make their recommendations through a chief of staff, who is primarily interested in the occupation force rather than Japanese internal affairs. Their opinions were thus often shelved. This has been particularly irking to G-2, which observers account the most efficient and effective of any of the occupation sections in the art of dealing firmly with the Japanese.

On the other hand, the chief of the military government section, Brig. Gen. Courtney Whitney, went straight to MacArthur with his ideas. Thus in the occupation a curious feature of prewar Jap Government was revived: The man with direct access to the throne had the best chance of gaining his objectives. Whitney also had the advantage of coming from Manila, a city with which MacArthur has long been associated. There Whitney was a lawyer, a skilled county-courthouse type of orator with the ability to turn dramatics off and on. He is a red-faced man of about 5 feet 6, inclined to be portly and short-tempered.

One odd development: Even though Whitney's MG fathered the purge, some MG officers are already claiming that it had to be undertaken because of direct orders from the 11-nation Far Eastern Commission sitting in Washington, where the Russians put something over. This alibi was not borne out in Washington, where neither the FEC nor the War Department even possesses up-to-date information on the purge—although the

State Department knows of the extent of recent developments.

THE BEATEN WONDER

Such is the background of the purge. The mystery remains as to why an American military government fell into this confusion of motives and actions. One possible reason was cabled by Pakenham: "Military government officers arrived expecting to run Japan and were disappointed at finding the Japanese Government functioning, although guided by MG. The MG contains many theoretical experts in limited phases, but otherwise they are immature, untrained for local conditions, blindly unconscious of their tremendous power, and unconcerned over the practical consequences."

It is an open question as to the extent to which General MacArthur is aware of the ideological implications of the actions of his military government. The very aloofness that made him a virtual god to the Japanese and was at least partly responsible for the original success of the occupation has also insulated him from contact with many developments.

There has, however, been no mystery about the results of the purge. One Japanese put it this way: "We know better than any that we have been beaten. We know the United States is entitled to impose any punishment it wants and to force us to make any amends it sets. But we can't understand why, when America could have all Japan working in its own interest, it is now engaged in wrecking the country so as to leave it as an eventual prize to the Russians."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I suggest that in connection with any consideration of this general subject which might be had as a result of the questions raised in the article, consideration also be given to certain things of a disquieting nature which have been reported in connection with our administration of and our activities in Korea.

JEWRY'S ROLE IN WORLD WAR II

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Truman Shares Pride in United States Jewry's Role in World War II"; an address entitled "Our War Record," delivered by Louis I. Dublin; and an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, at a dinner given by the National Jewish Welfare Boards in New York City on January 9, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

NUMBER OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a debate conducted by the magazine Pic, as printed in its issue of October 1946, regarding the size of Government forces, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIAL LABOR RELATIONS—ARTICLE BY DR. THOMAS H. HOWELLS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Permanent Remedy for Strikes," written by Thomas H. Howells and published in the Daily Camera, of Boulder, Colo., on December 14, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASIA AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT—ARTICLE BY OWEN LATTIMORE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Asia and the State Department," written by Owen Lattimore, Director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS
TOWARD WORLD GOVERNMENT—AD-
DRESS BY HON. HENRY USBORNE IN
BRITISH PARLIAMENT

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Henry Osborne, a member of the British Parliament, on November 12, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL SMALL
BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 20) appointing a Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to state the parliamentary situation. The Senate is proceeding today under a unanimous-consent agreement. At the hour of 2 o'clock the time will be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the pending resolution, under the control of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on one side and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on the other.

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to Senate Resolution 20, as printed and on the desk.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the question is on the adoption of the two amendments which I have proposed to Senate Resolution 20.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the Senator from Nebraska may wish to ask unanimous consent that the two amendments be considered together.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments may be considered together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the two amendments which I have offered to Senate Resolution 20 are as follows:

On page 2, line 4, after the words "Eightieth Congress", insert "for a period of 240 days after the date this resolution is agreed to."

On page 2, line 19, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as of January 31, 1947: *Provided*, That the authority of such special committee to hold hearings and conduct investigations shall terminate on the date this resolution is agreed to."

By unanimous consent just granted the two amendments are to be considered together as one.

The mechanical result of the amendments is to change the termination date of the committee, and limit its life to 8 months. If the resolution, as proposed to be amended, is adopted, the committee's activities will terminate on approximately the 1st day of next October. In other words, the Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business would operate during the time Congress is in session, and if it should happen to continue to be in session into the month of August, which is likely to happen, then the committee would have approximately 30 days in

which to publish its report, clean up its work, and terminate its existence by the 1st day of October of this year. I want the Members of the Senate to understand that I am sincere in offering the amendments to the resolution. When the time for termination of the committee arrives, as provided by the amendments, if in the opinion of the Senate there then is no further need for the special committee, it will be perfectly agreeable to me that it terminate its work, with the hope that the standing committees will by that time be fully organized so they can take jurisdiction not only of matters dealing with finance, not only with transportation rates and other transportation matters, not only with questions of monopoly and centralization of business, but that all standing committees will be so organized that the small businessmen of the country will have some place to go, where they can present their problems and have their difficulties ironed out.

Mr. President, if there are any questions to be asked concerning the amendments, I should be glad to answer them now. The amendments are merely mechanical in their nature. As I stated, the purpose of the amendments is simply to provide that the special committee shall function from this time until the present session of Congress ends, and when that time comes it will be perfectly agreeable to me to have a standing committee of the Senate take over the work of the special committee, if the standing committees are then sufficiently organized, and to have the special committee dealing with matters affecting small business then terminated.

Mr. President, the second amendment simply gives the present committee the opportunity to file such reports as it may have which have not been filed, and to pay off its personnel. They are entitled to their wages until the 31st of January, under a resolution adopted by the previous Congress which continued the committee until that date. The old committee should be given an opportunity to clear off its desk so that the new committee will not have to take over any unfinished business. I think it is only proper mechanically that the old committee should wind up its own affairs, pay its own bills, and publish its own reports, and that the new committee should not be responsible for any of the bills of the old committee, or for any reports which are not filed, or for any unfinished business. That is simply a mechanical amendment, such as is usually made in the case of a committee when it is terminated and another committee is created.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us why he asks for the creation of a new committee, instead of extending the old committee?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to do so. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that I tried in every way I could think of simply to extend the old committee.

At this point in the RECORD I should like to have printed as part of my remarks the original resolution creating the committee back in 1940.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth
Congress, third session

Resolved, That a special committee consisting of five Senators, to be appointed by the Vice President, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable, and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, during the Seventy-sixth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed \$15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked to have the original resolution printed at this point in the RECORD in order to show that the language of Senate Resolution 20, which proposes to create a new committee, is identical with the language of the original resolution, with one exception. Senate Resolution 20 provides for the appointment of a committee of 12. The membership of the old committee consisted of 12—7 Democrats and 5 Republicans. If the old committee were to be continued, there would be no way to bring about the proper numerical representation on the majority side. The present membership consists of six Democrats—former Senator Mead not now being a member of the Senate—and five Republicans. Senate Resolution 20 provides that the President pro tempore shall appoint a new committee of 12, so that the representation may be 7 on the majority side and 5 on the minority side.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not that be done by a simple continuing resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. It could not be done by a simple continuing resolution because that would call upon the President pro tempore to take 2 members from the Democratic side and replace them by 2 Members from the Republican side. I feel that that is a matter for the majority to consider. The majority should submit the names of Members, as is done in connection with all other committees.

A simple continuing resolution, such as the Senator suggests, would place the President pro tempore in an embarrassing situation. In my judgment, this is the only proper way to do it. I consulted several lawyers, and also the Legislative Counsel, and was informed that this way the only proper way to accomplish the purposes for which I submitted the resolution. I trust that that explanation is satisfactory.

Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks the colloquy engaged in on June 6, 1946, between the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the distinguished former Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette. This colloquy is found on pages 6394 and 6395 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question with reference to section 126 of the bill which reads:

"No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives."

My first question to the Senator is this: If that were the present law, would it have been impossible for the Senate to have set up, for example, a special committee to deal with the subject of atomic energy?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; except as the Senate has suspended the rules for that purpose. While the Senator was at lunch today at the White House, I discussed this matter with other persons. It does not, of course, affect any joint committees which may now be in existence, such as, for example, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. It would not affect the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. However, if we were confronted today with this rule, and the subject of atomic energy suddenly loomed on the horizon, and it was felt to be necessary to create a select or a special committee of either the Senate or of the other House, or a joint committee of both Houses to consider that highly important subject, it would be necessary for the Senate and the House, if the committee were to be a joint committee, to suspend their rules or, if the committee were to be a special committee of either House, it would be necessary for the House concerned to suspend its rules.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, the purpose of section 126 is to frown, so far as it can, upon that method of approach to legislation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The committee came to the conclusion that if we could reorganize the committees, and staff them adequately, it would be in the interest of orderly and efficient legislative procedure to have the standing committees or subcommittees thereof conduct studies and investigations, because, after all, if legislation is to flow from these activities, normally the select or joint committees do not have legislative power, and it is often necessary for the standing committee to thresh over much of the straw and the wheat that has been threshed over by a special or select joint committee, as the case may be.

However, I express it as my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that at any time when a matter of great consequence, such as atomic energy was when it first became a subject for consideration, and still is, for that matter, I have no doubt that the Senate and the House would suspend the rules to meet a situation of that kind.

The reason why we have drawn this tight ban is that we know full well, from long experience, that unless there is a ban, to obviate which very extraordinary action such as suspending the rules is required, we will not check the tendency to appoint select committees of both the House and the Senate, and joint select committees, of which we now have a considerable number in both Houses, and I anticipate that as time goes on, unless the action here proposed is taken, they will multiply in geometric progression.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can understand the purpose the Senator and his committee had in mind. Among other purposes, I assume, it is in line with the purpose to limit and concentrate the service which individual Senators themselves give to the problems assigned to their responsibility. On the other hand, I think this is one of the few places in the bill where I am not sure I agree with the philosophy of my able friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Assuming that there eventually will be some kind of reorganization of the House committees, or even if there is not, the bill does encourage joint action by the committees of opposite number in the two Houses.

The Senator has put his finger on one aspect of the situation, and I tried to mention the other. If he will look at the committee assignments of Senators in the directory, he will find that a great many Senators are now serving on select and special committees and joint committees. Our effort in this bill is to reduce the committee burden of Senators, so far as the multiplicity of committees is concerned, to the point where they will have sufficient time to discharge their full responsibilities to the committees upon which they serve.

I hope the Senator will give further consideration to the statement which I have made, which may not be a complete answer from his standpoint, but I think if a subject of vital importance comes up, and it is obvious that a special committee should be created, there will not be undue difficulty in having the rules of either House suspended for that purpose. But I fear that if we did not have this ban we might conceivably reorganize and reduce the Senate committees, and find our whole purpose and object defeated by a rash of select and special committees in the future, which would put us right back where we started.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator give me the citation in the bill where joint hearings are encouraged?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Section 122 provides: "The standing committees of the two Houses are authorized to hold joint hearings with respect to the subject matter within their respective jurisdictions."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I had not seen section 122. That goes a long way toward answering the thought I had in mind, for it seemed to me that in attempting to streamline the efficiency of congressional action there were many points at which the only possible practical approach was through an elimination of needless duplication between the House and Senate of activities in respect to legislation.

I particularly had in mind the precise point which is covered by section 122. So that my distinguished friend disarms me substantially by his reference to that section. However, I would not want section 126 to be read as meaning that we do not recognize that there may be extraordinary situations, of which the best illustration at the moment is the control of atomic energy, which are better served by special and select committees, and perhaps by joint committees.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to point out this particular passage in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from

Michigan, when he stated, in reply to the former Senator from Wisconsin.

On the other hand, this is one of the few places in the bill—

The Senator from Michigan was speaking of section 126—

where I am not sure I agree with the philosophy of my able friend from Wisconsin.

The colloquy continues to the next page. These are the words of the then Senator from Wisconsin in reply to that observation:

I hope the Senator will give further consideration to the statement which I have made, which may not be a complete answer from his standpoint, but I think if a subject of vital importance comes up when it is obvious that a special committee should be created, there will not be undue difficulty in having the rules of either the House or the Senate suspended for that purpose.

I point out once more to Members of the Senate that those were the words of the then Senator from Wisconsin, who drafted the bill and sponsored it on the floor of the Senate. He was speaking in reply to the query of the Senator from Michigan, who inquired of the Senator from Wisconsin whether it was his intention, in view of the elimination of section 126 prohibiting special committees, that such committees should ever be created. The Senator from Wisconsin stated that they should be created whenever a majority of the Senate felt that it was important that they be created. I think it is important to have that colloquy in the RECORD at this point. We now have a precedent, inasmuch as the Senate has adopted the resolution continuing the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I claim that that precedent is supported by the spirit of the interpretation given by former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the colloquy engaged in on January 20 of this year between the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. This colloquy is found on page 455 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Illinois referred to my record on the Reorganization Act with great kindness and helpfulness. He indicated, however, that, on the basis of the record, unless I declined to approve an extension of this special committee, I would not be in harmony with my original position.

I know the Senator would not wish to do the record any injustice, and, therefore, with his permission, I should like to call his attention to the remainder of my colloquy with the able former Senator from Wisconsin, on the prior page of the RECORD from which he read.

Mr. LUCAS. What page is that?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Page 6394 of the RECORD for June 6, 1946. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that after I had interrogated the Senator from Wisconsin about my belief that there were sometimes situations which

could better be served by special or select committees than by regular committees, and he had made his reply substantially conceding that such a situation could arise, I said—and I read from the RECORD:

"I think this is one of the few places in the bill where I am not sure I agree with the philosophy of my able friend from Wisconsin."

Then I call the able Senator's attention to the additional statement in the following colloquy, when I again said:

"However, I would not want section 126"—

The section proscribing special committees—

"I would not want section 126 to be read as meaning that we do not recognize that there may be extraordinary situations, of which the best illustration at the moment is the control of atomic energy, which are better served by special and select committees, and perhaps by joint committees."

To which the able Senator from Wisconsin, the author of the bill, replied:

"I grant that point, and have conceded it in the brief time we have been able to devote to the consideration of the bill today."

I am not entering this controversy on the pending resolution. I am merely indicating to my able friend from Illinois that I think a fair interpretation of the RECORD will show that my position with respect to special committees, as indicated in the debate from which the Senator quoted, is that if there is a situation which in my judgment recommends a special committee as the more useful approach to a successful conclusion, it is my interpretation, and was at the time, that I would be free so to vote; and I think the Senator from Wisconsin concurred that I would enjoy that freedom.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I invite special attention to the answer which the Senator from Michigan made to the Senator from Illinois relative to whether or not we have authority to create special committees. The distinguished Senator from Michigan called the attention of the distinguished Senator from Illinois to the words of Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, stating that if and when the Senate felt it to be sufficiently important it could by a majority vote, create a special committee for any purpose which the Senate might desire.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska brought my name into the discussion by referring to the colloquy with the able Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Michigan took the very definite position in the colloquy he had with the Senator from Illinois that when he felt that a subject matter was of extraordinary importance—I believe he referred to the Atomic Energy Committee by way of example—he would feel justified in supporting a proposal to create a special committee to investigate such a subject. I think he used the word extraordinary. Certainly the Senator from Nebraska will not contend that the continuation of the Small Business Committee comes within the category to which the Senator from Michigan referred the other day. If he does so contend, then Senators on the other side of the aisle must support a request of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] for a special petroleum committee. They must support the request of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] for a special wool committee. They must support re-

quests for practically every other special committee. In my judgment the Small Business Committee is not as important from the standpoint of national defense and from the standpoint of national economy as is the Special Petroleum Committee, which, from those standpoints, is really worth while.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois be printed at the end of my remarks, because I am trying to make a record that will be of interest to other Senators. If the Senator from Illinois would like to engage me in a colloquy at the end of this speech, I will be glad to answer any interpretation that he might place on the remarks of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. LUCAS. I object to that, because I want my remarks to appear in this part of the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not yield further.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. I would like to say, in answer to the observation just made by the Senator from Illinois, that he has a perfect right to interpret what was said by the Senator from Michigan in any way he wishes; but I submit, upon the RECORD—and I am only speaking on the RECORD with reference to what the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, pointed out in no uncertain terms: That if the membership of the Senate felt that a subject matter was sufficiently important to be submitted to a special committee, such a special committee might be created. I am simply following the RECORD.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I decline to yield at this point.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I decline to yield at this time. I shall be glad to answer any questions when I have concluded. I never refuse to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

We are going to hear our friends across the aisle say "This is not important." I wish the RECORD to show that Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, who sponsored the reorganization bill, stated that under the provisions of section 126 if, in the opinion of the Senate, subject matter was of sufficient importance to call for such action, that the Senate could suspend the rules without violating the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act. The Senator from Illinois has a perfect right to interpret the act in any way he sees fit; I am not questioning that; but, as I read the remarks of Senator La Follette, that is exactly what he said.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in the colloquy last Wednesday with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, again stated his position in the matter, and I propose to quote his words:

I am not entering this controversy on the pending resolution. I am merely indicating to my able friend from Illinois that I think

a fair interpretation of the RECORD will show that my position with respect to special committees, as indicated in the debate from which the Senator quoted, is that if there is a situation which in my judgment recommends a special committee as the more useful approach to a successful conclusion, it is my interpretation, and as at the time, that I would be free so to vote; and I think the Senator from Wisconsin concurred that I would enjoy that freedom.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield in a moment.

That was the answer of the Senator from Michigan; and certainly he has the right to interpret his own viewpoint with regard to the La Follette-Monroney Act. It is written in the RECORD. It is my interpretation, as I stated when the resolution was submitted, that it resolves itself down to this simple equation, that the resolution which is before the Senate, creating or continuing the special committee, involves a matter of sufficient importance as to justify the Senate in continuing the Small Business Committee for a period of 8 months. That is the only question before the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is no doubt in the world, I think, that the Senate can create a special committee if it cares to do so. It took such action on Wednesday last. But I would like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he does not feel that it is a reflection on the able, competent, and outstanding Committee on Banking and Currency to take away from that committee a function which is specifically set out in the Reorganization Act as being a part of the work of that committee, namely, the problem of small businessmen. That is set forth in the act as one of the specific functions of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I ask the able Senator from Nebraska, is it not a reflection upon the mentality, the competence, and the standing of this committee, so recently created and given this particular work, to say, "No; it cannot do this work. Another committee can do it better, and therefore we are going to ignore the specific language of the Reorganization Act."

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to answer the question. It is a perfectly fair question and it is asked in good faith, and I shall answer it in that way.

We are not reflecting, in this resolution, upon the mentality or the ability of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, or of any member of that committee to which any problem of small business might be submitted. I point out to the distinguished Senator from Maryland the fact that when the resolution creating or extending the Small Business Committee was brought before the Senate there was some discussion about it. Does the Senator recall that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] asked a parliamentary question? He said, "I believe that this resolution extending the Small Business Committee should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce." Does the Senator remember that? He then took his seat, and the distinguished

Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] arose and said that he had a parliamentary inquiry. The occupant of the chair said, "The Senator will state it." The Senator from Georgia said, "If the present occupant of the chair were now to rule as to the committee to which this resolution should be referred, to what committee would it be referred?" Does the Senator recall what he said?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not.

Mr. WHERRY. I will tell the Senator. He was present that afternoon. The Chair stated that if it were left to him and he were to refer the resolution, he would refer it to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Does the Senator remember that colloquy, now that I have called it to his attention?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. WHERRY. It is in the RECORD. The Senator can read it.

Another thing happened. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has been here longer than most of us have and knows more about the rules than does the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maryland together. He rose to his feet and said he objected to the opinion of the Parliamentarian, and that the resolution should go to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggested that the Committee on the Judiciary might have an interest in the subject matter, inasmuch as I understood that the purpose of the Small Business Committee was to prevent monopolies, and that that was a matter under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I did not express the opinion exactly as attributed to me, because, obviously, there are many phases of the question. That was one phase of it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the statement of the distinguished Senator from Arizona be placed in full in the RECORD at this point, because his remarks are self-explanatory and will answer the question.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, on Wednesday, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and myself, I submitted a resolution, Senate Resolution 40, providing for the extension of the Special Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources. It had been my expectation that that resolution would be referred, as these other two resolutions were referred, to the Committee on Rules and Administration; but I notice that it has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands, which I believe to be an erroneous reference. I should like to have unanimous consent, since there has been no action on the resolution, that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAYDEN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to point out that the rule of the Senate up to this time has been that no special investigating committee could be created unless a resolution had been reported by the appropriate standing committee of the Senate and then referred to the Commit-

tee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The functions of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate have been absorbed by the Committee on Rules and Administration. When the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] introduced his resolution on Wednesday he asked unanimous consent to have it referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that is how that committee got it. In suggesting references, normally the Parliamentarian is perfectly right.

The resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska reads as follows:

"Resolved, That paragraph (c) (1) (A) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided, That any resolution proposing to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a special or select joint committee, shall not be referred to any other standing committee of the Senate but shall be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration of all phases thereof, including the substantive matter.'"

Until the Senate adopts such a rule, under the rule of the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma should be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. That is where it belongs. I object to its reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration until the Committee on Public Lands has considered it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Chair to paragraph 7, on page 7, of the Reorganization Act, under the heading "Committee on the Judiciary." It provides that that committee shall have jurisdiction of the "protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies."

I understand that the real purpose of the Small Business Committee is to assure protection of small business against restraints and monopolies. So I think that the question hinges upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has asked me a question and I am trying to answer it. The Senator has said that the action referred to was a reflection, and I say it is not a reflection. Under the La Follette-Monroney Act the Committee on Banking and Currency would take jurisdiction of matters affecting small business only when a financial question was involved. The Committee on the Judiciary would take jurisdiction of monopoly and centralization questions. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would take jurisdiction of freight rates and transportation matters. So the answer is that when a special committee cuts across the lines of the Committee on Banking and Currency it is no reflection upon that committee because that committee, if it stays within the jurisdiction which the act assigns to it, does not have jurisdiction of two-thirds of the matters that come before other standing committees of the Senate which would have to handle those problems.

So if the work were centralized in one special committee, such committee would simply do the work of the full committees which have been mentioned as having some interest in that field. On the committee, probably, there would be not only some of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee's subcommittees which deal with the prob-

lems confronting small business but also some of the members of the Judiciary Committee and some of the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Such a membership would enable the special committee to function all the way along the line.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not through yet. The Senator from Maryland asked me a question, and I wish to answer it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Nebraska had answered my question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also wish to say that I am not asking that the special committee be made a permanent special committee. I see no reason why, in the future, the Senate cannot use for such purposes the Banking and Currency Committee and the other committees which otherwise would handle such problems. For instance, I refer to the Judiciary Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as well. When those committees are properly organized they can take care of the subject matter, and then the Senate can terminate the work of the special committee which is proposed by Senate Resolution 20. Because of that fact I have amended the resolution so as to provide for the continuation of the special committee for only 240 days.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator for his answer; but let me state that questions as to where a bill is to go or is not to go, or what was said, or what was not said, are irrelevant to this debate, because, I point out to the Senator from Nebraska, that the argument adverted to took place on the floor of the Senate before the Reorganization Act went into effect. Today we have the Reorganization Act, under which 15 committees have been set up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the colloquy I have mentioned occurred last Monday on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to finish?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am speaking of the creation of the original Special Committee on Small Business, at which time the Reorganization Act had not gone into effect.

Let me ask the Senator from Nebraska whether the very argument he now makes for the Special Committee on Small Business could not likewise be made for the continuation of the Special Committee on Wool, which has to do with freight rates and with Government finance, direct or indirect, and with small business dealing with all the things the Senator has mentioned. Could not the same arguments be made for the continuation of the Special Committee on Silver, because related to silver are questions regarding the private manufacture or use of silver, in connection with the making of silverware, as well as a variety of other things, such as the medical and scientific uses of silver?

So, Mr. President, every argument which is being made for the Special Com-

mittee on Small Business could be made equally well with respect to the need for the continuation of every other special committee which is or will be sought to be established despite the existence of the Reorganization Act.

Therefore, if we set up a special committee for small business, we would be committed to set up other special committees for all the other special subjects which have been mentioned; and the result would be the destruction of the machinery of the Reorganization Act, which was so widely heralded by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Maryland whether what he has just stated is a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is a question. I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether it is true that the same argument which he is making for the continuation of the Special Committee on Small Business could be made with equal force in favor of the continuation or creation of the Special Committee on Wool or a special committee on gold, or a special committee on petroleum, or a special committee to deal with any other subject with which a special committee might concern itself?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in answer to that question, I wish to state in all sincerity that I believe that the Special Committee on Small Business is the most important special committee which could be organized by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall answer the Senator's question now. I have the floor.

Let me say that I have been on the Special Committee on Small Business for a number of years.

Mr. TYDINGS. I simply wished to point out to the Senator from Nebraska—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not yield at this point. I am going to answer the question the Senator from Maryland has asked me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I was about to say, I have been a member of the Committee on Small Business for 4 years. I have handled complaint after complaint, some of them coming right from the State of the Senator from Maryland. I have handled many complaints arising because of priorities and because of control regulations. At this time the special committee has 20 applications for investigations. One of them is for an investigation into the newsprint situation. We have already set that matter for a hearing. It involves every small newspaper in the State of Maryland, as well as every other small newspaper in the United States of America.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not choose to yield at this point. I am answering the question which has been asked me by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, in the past 4 years there have come before the Senate's Special Committee on Small Business more than 200,000 letters, more than 200,000 mes-

sages from small business throughout the United States, asking for aid. In the consideration of those requests, the Special Committee on Small Business during the last 4 years has conducted 3,000 open hearings, at which people from all the States of the Union have appeared. Representatives of tire manufacturers, of furniture makers and dealers, of bakers, and of various other industries, of almost every industry in the United States, have appeared at those hearings. Representatives of practically all industries have come to the Special Committee on Small Business requesting relief and seeking the removal from their backs of Government controls.

I remember very well the hearings on the meat situation. Does not the Senator from Maryland also remember them? They were held in the days when the Senate was deciding whether the Government should continue the controls on meat. I wish to state that 90 percent of the evidence which was used on the floor of the Senate in the debate on the question of continuing or removing the controls from meat was obtained directly from the Special Committee on Small Business of the Senate. Let us not forget that. At that time we were convinced from the reports which we received from small businessmen, such as the butchers, the meat packers, and practically all the other businessmen concerned, that the controls on meat should be removed and must be removed; and when the question of the removal of the controls from meat was being discussed on the floor of the Senate for 31 days, I said that if the Congress removed those controls, it would be possible for the people to purchase meat. But the Senator from Maryland and many of his associates on the other side of the aisle said, "Oh, no. Leave the ceilings on. If they are removed prices will skyrocket, and people will not be able to buy meat." But, Mr. President, the ceilings were removed; and today our people can buy meat at prices comparable to those of June 1946. Today the question is whether the price of meat will have to be maintained rather than reduced.

So, Mr. President, if I am asked whether the Special Committee on Small Business is important, I say it is one of the most important committees in the Senate of the United States. It is all very well for the Government to prosecute the men who recently have been charged with improperly obtaining \$400,000,000; but I say to you, Mr. President, that the ones who need special help during this postwar period are the small businessmen—the small grocers, the small druggists, and other small businessmen of their type.

So I shall refuse to permit myself to be talked down or to consent to a cessation of this activity for the next 8 months, merely because someone says it is in violation of the La Follette-Monroney Act. I was one of the Senators who voted for the passage of that act; and when I did so it was with the full knowledge that I could vote for the continuation of the Special Committee on Small Business, if I so desired. When I vote for the continuation of that special committee it certainly is not a breach of faith on my

part. The continuation of the Small Business Committee certainly cannot be construed to be a precedent, and certainly it is not a step counter to the interpretation made by Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, or counter to the remarks and interpretation made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The Special Committee on Small Business is important, and it should be continued for 8 months, for it is the only committee that will give the small businessmen of America the relief they need now, until the regular committees take over the work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield now.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have listened to the Senator's remarks with great interest, but let me call his attention to the fact that the Senator from Maryland who now is speaking was absent on a mission, in accordance with a law passed by Congress, for a great deal of the time at the end of the last session of Congress, so probably the Senator from Nebraska is a little too inclusive in his statement of facts when he incorporates the Senator from Maryland in his assertions.

However, I have listened to the Senator from Nebraska with interest. He has not yet answered my point, which is that I am not able to understand why all the purposes he has mentioned could not be as well accomplished by the Committee on Banking and Currency as by the special committee which is proposed to be set up. Every argument he has made would apply with equal force to the efficiency of the Banking and Currency Committee under the able chairmanship of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], whose particular duty it is to handle that character of work. I do not deny that during the war the Special Committee on Small Business, on which the Senator from Nebraska served, has done everything it possibly could do to aid small business. But at present, the fact is that we have before the Senate the question whether the standing committee concerned can do the job or whether it cannot; and by inference the Senator from Nebraska has been arguing that the standing committee cannot do the job. Certainly there is no other reason for the continuation or creation of the special committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the colloquy and the observations, because, as he knows, I have great admiration for the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The feeling is mutual.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, let me say that continual reference by way of argument to special committees on this, that, or the other subject is beside the point. The only question now before the Senate is whether Senators in their judgment believe that the Special Committee on Small Business is of such importance that it should be continued for 8 months. That is the only issue before the Senate. If Senators do not wish to give small businessmen the protection they need, if Senators wish to cause chaos for the next 8 months, if Senators wish to drive the

small businessmen here and there, and make it impossible for them to know where to go. Senators have a perfect right to do so. All Members of the Senate have a perfect right to do whatever they wish to do.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to answer the Senator's other question. We hear the same old contentions urged as to this committee and that committee. I do not know about the special wool committee. I do not know what we will do about other special committees. The only question now before the Senate is whether the Small Business Committee is to be continued for 8 months.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Not now. I shall yield when I conclude my answer to the Senator's question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the only question is as to the continuance of the Small Business Committee for 8 months, and in his "needling," if it may be called such, the Senator from Maryland is attempting to distract from what I am attempting to say, and he is not going to have very much luck, because the question to be decided is simply this, Is there a desire to continue the Small Business Committee? I say it is the most important committee in the United States Senate. I have a right to my interpretation, and the distinguished Senator has a right to his.

There is no reflection at all upon the standing committee, because if the Senator will take the Reorganization Act itself and turn to page 5, subparagraph (d), he will find the only jurisdiction the Committee on Banking and Currency has over small business; and that pertains merely to loans. Unfortunately, today, with the blanket termination policy announced by the RFC, there is not a place in the world for the small businessman to go to get a loan except to his banker.

Mr. TOBEY. If the Senator from Nebraska will yield, let me say that he is wrong in that respect.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield. I am answering a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois after I finish the answer. There is no one to whom I would rather yield than the Senator from Illinois. If there is any provision for a loan, it is so difficult to get it that a small businessman cannot even start to get it. Under the Reorganization Act that is the only subject matter of which the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction. It does not, as the distinguished Senator knows, have jurisdiction of questions relating to the monopoly control of newspapers. Such matters go to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on Banking and Currency has no jurisdiction over rates, trans-

portation, or 101 other things which come within the province of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I am merely saying, Mr. President, that today the only way problems of small business can be handled in a coordinated way, after 6 years in which the small businessmen have been taught to come to the Senate's Small Business Committee and the House Committee on Small Business, is by seeking that avenue of relief. They have been taught to come here, and the only thing I am asking is that we continue that relief and continue that avenue for 8 months, until in the meantime the standing committees can be organized.

If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency desires to appoint a subcommittee to study these problems, he is entitled to do that, but certainly the distinguished Senator from Maryland will not contradict the statement that that committee, in the absence of broad authority conferred upon it, has no authority to take up matters relating to monopoly control, and centralization in interstate commerce.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator is making out a splendid case—

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. TYDINGS. For action by this body in the field of small business, but he is not making out a case showing why the standing committees which ought to have, and do have, jurisdiction over this subject matter should not do the job. It is to that point that I should like to have him address himself.

Mr. WHERRY. I have certainly gone over that point time and time again, and I do not want to take further time of the Senate to elucidate it. If the Senator from Maryland is not convinced, and will telephone me in my office, I will have a private interview with him, and try to tell him what I have been attempting to tell the Senate for some time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have here—

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator from Illinois going to talk about the Budget?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I am going to talk about small business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has the blue-bound volume before him.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska made a statement about the continuance of the Small Business Committee. I wish to call his attention to some remarks he made before the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate when there came up before that committee the question of the continuance—

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is not asking me a question. I yielded only for a question. I shall be glad to take that up at the termination of my remarks. I shall not yield for any other purpose than for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised that the Senator declines to yield.

REASONS WHY THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE SHOULD CONTINUE ITS WORK

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the prime reason for the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee is to have a committee to which the small businessmen of the country can turn during this transition period. It is essential pending the time when the standing committees are organized and able to take over the work that has been done by the Small Business Committee.

It should continue to fill this gap, as I have stated many times, because the small businessmen of the country for 6 years have come to the Small Business Committee with their problems. So long as we have regulations and priorities to the extent that we have them now, there is a dire need for a committee to handle these problems until the standing committees are acquainted with them and can set up subcommittees to assume this burdensome work.

Even though the standing committees of the Senate made every effort to assume the problems of small business as a subcommittee function, the proof that delay would occur is found in the fact that small business had no special place in the regular committee system prior to 1940.

When the Senate created the Special Small Business Committee in 1940, it was the first official recognition of any agency of Government that the problems of small business must be dealt with separately and distinct from the general problems of national economic concern and business generally.

Today it is neither accurate nor wise to assume that the small businessmen no longer confront the problems growing out of Government control and unequal competition with big business. Certainly that cannot be assumed, because there is an acute situation today. Even with the release of controls, it is very difficult for small businessmen to get the commodities, the merchandise, and the building materials they desire.

No one will deny that small enterprises must be preserved as a basic part of our economic fabric. The United States is founded on freedom of enterprise and free competitive activity. We cannot maintain these without a healthy, militant, and dynamic small-business community.

True, some of the hazards and obstructions confronting small business during the wartime period have been removed and others are in the process of liquidation. But the small businessman is not yet out of the woods. He still is beset with artificial shortages, governmental red tape and regulation, and the very serious situation of a big-business system grown even bigger under the stimulus of wartime conditions.

I think it was the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] who, in a speech on the Senate floor, gave some figures relating to the part played by corporations in wartime activities. While I shall not attempt to quote the statistics accurately, if I recall correctly he made the statement that in the United States nearly 75 percent of the wartime tasks were performed by less than 100

corporations which were paid billions upon billions of dollars. That is the extent to which centralization developed under wartime controls.

As wartime controls are unwound, the need for a small business committee will become more and more apparent. Because of this, the Congress owes the small businessman the continued service of a special committee which is familiar with his problems and sympathetic with his objectives. I cannot see how that can be denied. I cannot see how a Senator on either side of the aisle can vote against the continuance, for 8 months, of the Small Business Committee. Of all the committees of the United States Senate, I think it is the one committee most needed. In my opinion we should have a standing committee that would do this work.

The importance of small business can be illustrated briefly in the field of manufacturing alone.

Prior to the war, small manufacturers operated 190,000 plants, employing 9,000,000 workers. Big industry, employing 500 or more workers, functioned through only 3,000 concerns, employing 6,000,000 workers. Need we have any other proof that so-called small business is a backbone of American life?

Small business does not need, nor am I here advocating, any form of paternalistic government protection. It only needs a fair chance to compete, to survive, and to prosper. The very life of small American communities depends on the small businessman—the independent merchant, and the man who publishes a weekly newspaper. It is from the weekly newspapers that we get the opinions of the people of the country; and we need to preserve the small newspapers throughout the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WHERRY. For a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield gladly.

Mr. TAYLOR. A moment ago I understood the Senator to say he thought the committee should be made a standing committee. May I ask why he does not incorporate that principle in his resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that would be a complete violation of the La Follette-Monroney Act. The Senator from Idaho would not wish to have me do that; he is for the Monroney Act.

Mr. TAYLOR. If we are going to violate it, why not violate it completely?

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator vote for such a proposal?

Mr. TAYLOR. For a standing small-business committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. Would the Senator vote for it?

Mr. TAYLOR. I should be more inclined to vote for it than for this temporary extension. I might vote for a standing committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the Senator from Idaho would not vote for that, and he is not going to vote for the pending

proposal. We all understand that; and he has a perfect right not to do it. The Senator from Idaho may do as he pleases about it, but he has been on the Small Business Committee, and he knows as well as I do that the 3,000 problems we have handled cut across all standing committee lines. The Senator from Idaho, who sat in the hearings, over some of which he presided as chairman, will not controvert that statement. I think we all understand that the problems covered by the hearing related not only to banking and financial matters but to allocations, priorities, freight rates, and many other matters.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would not that be true of any committee that might be created?

Mr. WHERRY. I think not. I think there can be no doubt that the standing committees are given clearly outlined jurisdiction.

I admit that if this special committee is set up the Senate will be giving it authority, as has been done in the past, and I think properly so, to consider problems which, under the Monroney Act, come under the jurisdiction of various standing committees. But, in my opinion—and I think the Senator from Idaho should agree with me, because he is interested in small business—

Mr. TAYLOR. I am.

Mr. WHERRY. The continuation of the Small Business Committee for 8 months, until such time as its activities can be taken over by the standing committees where they belong, will serve to help those committees. It will assist them in getting started, and help in the determination of policy and jurisdiction, and thus enable businessmen to know what committees to consult in order to obtain needed relief. I cannot see how else it can be done.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot see the objective of extending temporarily the special committee, because sometime, and it might as well be now, its work will be taken over by the standing committees.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has a perfect right to his opinion, but small business needs a fair chance to compete and to survive. The very life of little American communities, as I have said, depends upon small business. It is the necessary complement to a prosperous agriculture.

In my section small communities are necessary and so are the small businessmen. Many persons who live in the country are dependent upon the small towns. Sometimes the nearest one is 25 or 50 miles away, but there they go to do their shopping. We cannot afford to lose these small communities and cannot afford to lose the small businessman. It means the difference between jobs and unemployment for millions of American workers.

Our aim is to keep small business functioning, for the employment problem is involved. Every little business that can be kept operating means that much more employment, that much more production; and that is what we need in this postwar era.

This is no emotional appeal which I am making to the Members of the Senate. It is a statement of cold, hard facts. Today there simply is no agency or department of government which can concern itself adequately with the problems of small business.

With all respect to the work of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in its time and the continuing activities in the Commerce Department in behalf of small business, there remains a real and pressing need for a Senate Special Small Business Committee to act as a guiding hand and a friend at court during the transitional period of the next 8 months.

I quote an expression of the President:

The antitrust laws should be implemented—

That is for the judiciary—

and, simultaneously, small business and new enterprise should be encouraged by research and credit programs—

That is a matter for the Committee on Banking and Currency. I may add they should also be encouraged by an adequate study of freight rates and transportation problems, which is a matter for Interstate Commerce—

this for the opponents of "bigness."

The President himself is interested in the small businessman, and certainly the President, so far as was in his power, would assist any committee, whether it were a special committee or a standing committee, in its efforts to help the small businessmen to obtain materials and merchandise which they could sell to those who wanted to buy.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree with the Senator that small business does need help; that is, their interests must be looked after, for they need protection more than help. But will not the Senator agree that if the Small Business Committee makes investigations to determine what should be done, that their findings will have to be referred to various standing committees, who in turn will have to investigate the matters all over again in order to familiarize themselves with the subject?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho well knows that any proposed legislation which develops as a result of hearings is referred to the standing committees; and properly so. But I submit to the Senator from Idaho that in the 3,000 complaints presented to and heard by the special committee questions of legislation were not primarily involved. There were involved questions of priorities, of controls, and other questions which it would be very difficult to siphon out and assign to any one particular committee. The Senator must know that to be so.

Until the Senate can establish one committee to handle the multitudinous problems of small business and make provision which will enable businessmen to continue at work, it seems to me, if we wish to be fair and honest about it

in our own minds and eliminate politics and party-line votes, that every Member of the Senate should be glad to continue the Small Business Committee for 8 months.

In what we are undertaking to do for small business, I shall be the first man in the Senate to cooperate with other committees. I will cooperate with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who is a very able man and whose ability I would not question. But some of us who have been on the special committee for 4 years, and have studied the problems presented to it, could be, I think, of real service to him in establishing a subcommittee to handle banking and financial matters for small business.

I am not on the Banking and Currency Committee, but I should be glad indeed to help the Senator from New Hampshire along that line.

I will say the same thing with regard to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It is not my intention at all to continue the special committee 1 day longer than is necessary in order to provide for the period of transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. I think there is a definite gap at this time, and I believe there is necessity that this resolution be passed so that the work of the committee may be extended for the next 8 months.

Mr. President, in conclusion I should like to place certain communications in the RECORD. I have here, I estimate, nearly 50 or 60 telegrams and letters. During the past 3 weeks since this discussion began businessmen from all over the country, business associations, and groups have come forward and asked that the Small Business Committee be continued.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not proposing to read them all. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have understood that the telegrams and letters to which the Senator refers were solicited by the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. By the Small Business Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask the Senator how many telegrams were sent and how many telephone calls were made at Government expense by the Small Business Committee, soliciting support throughout the Nation for the continuation of this committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not believe one dime was spent by the Small Business Committee itself. I shall be glad to check with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. No request was ever made by me or my office. What telegrams I have had and the Business Committee has had, I am very well satisfied, have come from businessmen many of whom were personal acquaintances. I shall be glad to ask the Senator from Montana, or the clerk of the committee, if any solicitation was made. As the Senator must know, I do not favor pres-

sure campaigns. If desired, I shall be glad to read every one of these communications.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I will read them in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to place them in the RECORD. To the best of my knowledge, I do not believe that the Senate Small Business Committee made solicitations whatsoever. There is one committee of which Dewey Anderson is chairman, but I did not receive a communication from him. I am satisfied that these telegrams reflect honestly the opinions and the desires of the business associations throughout the country, in the interest of small business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Small businessmen in my State say they have been solicited—

Mr. WHERRY. I do not doubt that at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. By the Senator—

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And by representatives of the Senate, and that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the Senator will find that if there has been any solicitation it has been by small business associations among themselves, who are interested in having the special committee continue its work. To my knowledge—and I believe I can speak with authority—the Small Business Committee of the Senate itself has not solicited one of these telegrams.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Have any of the employees of the Small Business Committee done any soliciting among the Senators?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I do not believe so. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been so solicited.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that he has been solicited by an employee of the Small Business Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; by an employee of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Who is the employee of the Small Business Committee that solicited telegrams from the Senator?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is unnecessary for me to give names. I am telling the Senator that I have been solicited by employees of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that someone else, aside from those connected with the committee, who is interested in the continuation of the Small Business Committee, may have done so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Colorado is not mistaken.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean to imply, Mr. President, that the Senator was not giving his honest opinion, but to my knowledge there has been no such effort made.

I ask to have the telegrams, to which I have referred, printed in the RECORD for what they are worth. Senators can

read them and judge them for themselves. There are probably 33 from a majority of the small-business associations of the country or individuals interested in small business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegrams will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegrams are as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., January 20, 1947.

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

National Retail Hardware Association representing over 20,000 hardware dealers urges continuation of Senate Committee To Investigate Problems of Small Businessmen.

RIVERS PETERSON,
Managing Director.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 20, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely trust Senate will continue Small Business Committee as unit to protect interest of independent small business. This association and its members appreciate fully helpful interest of this committee in past and feels continuation of committee as separate entity vital preservation of small business to have such representation in Senate.

C. R. THEBAUT, Jr.,
President, National Association
of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 20, 1947.

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate:

On behalf of more than 16,000 farm-equipment dealers throughout United States, we recommend continuance of Senate Small Business Committee. Many problems facing businessmen in rural areas in next few months demand investigation by that committee.

PAUL M. MULLIKEN,
Executive Secretary, National Retail
Farm Equipment Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 20, 1947.

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate:

We firmly believe that the Senate Small Business Committee should be continued, and will appreciate any effort you may make to that end.

HARRY R. WAINWRIGHT,
Executive Director, Retail Gasoline
Dealers Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 20, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Urgently request your strong support renewal Senate Small Business Committee.

C. C. SIMPSON,
Managing Director, National Electrical
Retailers Association.

CHICAGO, ILL., January 20, 1947.

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Our association urges the renewal and continued usefulness of the Senate Small Business Committee. This activity gives recognition to the interests of a segment of our economy that it is important to protect and foster, particularly in this postwar period, when so many adjustments are to be made. I hope you will bring all your influence to bear in furtherance of this essential work.

FRANK M. WHISTON,
President, National Association of
Building Owners and Managers.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 20, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,

United States Capitol:

Our association believes that the activities of the Senate Small Business Committee have been of benefit to small business as a whole, and would earnestly urge that this committee be continued by the Eightieth Congress.

UNITED STATES WHOLESALE
GROCERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 20, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Office Building:

Board of directors of the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute in session today in advance of annual convention beginning tomorrow. Urge strongly your support toward continuation Senate Small Business Committee. This committee always has been responsible and effective, and must be continued if small-business interests are to be adequately protected. You realize, of course, that failure to support this committee might be construed as an indication of unfriendliness toward small business.

HENRY MATTER,
*Managing Director, Wholesale Dry
Goods Institute.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 21, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Office Building:

Understand S. 20 scheduled for consideration promptly after disposition resolution relative continuation War Investigating Committee. Past experience shows more intelligent and effective attention given problems lumber wholesalers by Small Business Committees of Senate and House than any other congressional committee. While favoring improvement cumbersome legislative machinery intended by Reorganization Act, nevertheless, during formative or organization period, it would be desirable our group, representing lumber wholesalers in 38 States, to continue Senate Small Business Committee as a special committee even if only for limited period time. A special committee can the better go into many ramifications of some special problem more comprehensively than a subcommittee of some regular standing committee more or less limited to matters of broad nature. Lumber wholesalers distribute two-thirds of lumber production.

SID L. DARLING,
*Secretary, National American
Wholesale Lumber Association,
Inc.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 21, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Office Building:

End of wartime controls has not witnessed the end of the problems of small business in the wine industry. We need the continued support and assistance of the Senate Small Business Committee, which was of such immeasurable aid to us during the war. A special committee dealing only in the problems of small business must be set up by the Senate. We endorse your resolution 100 percent.

MORRIS SLEPIAN,
President, National Wine Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 21, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Office Building:

Senate Small Business Committee of immeasurable assistance to small business in our industry. Period of reconversion equally as important as war period. Passage of your resolution calling for continuance of com-

mittee is vital to the interests of small business throughout the country.

MAYONNAISE AND SALAD DRESSING
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 21, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Office Building:

Imperative that your resolution to continue the Select Committee on Small Business be adopted by the United States Senate. During the dark war years when the administration, through insidious regulations, fostered monopolies in the meat business, your committee was the only ray of sunshine for the small businessman in the meat industry. The monopolies are not giving up the ground gained during the period of Government regulations, and small business still requires an ear and a capable voice. We must have your continued help.

BUCKLEY & DANZANSKY,
*Counsel, National Association Non-
slaughtering Meat Processors and
Wholesalers, Inc.*

JANUARY 21, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of the American Warehousemen's Association and its constituent divisions, the National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses and American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division, I urge the continuation in the Eightieth Congress of the Senate Special Committee on Small Business. American Warehousemen's Association is the recognized spokesman for the public merchandise warehousing industry and the public refrigerated warehousing industry of the Nation, composed of thousands of independent private enterprises, of which practically 100 percent qualify as "small business" as defined by the War Assets Administration in its administration of the Surplus Property Act. Public warehousemen need during reconversion the same consideration accorded other small business enterprises to enable them to contribute to the reestablishment of our Nation's normal competitive economy.

CHARLES E. NICHOLS,
*Secretary, American Warehousemen's
Association, Merchandise Division.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 21, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Office Building:

The National Association of Master Plumbers, with over 12,000 plumbing and heating contractor members, urgently requests the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee. Our members are all small businessmen in the true sense of the word, operating in business volumes from \$5,000 to millions of dollars annually. Through its activities the Senate Small Business Committee can contribute much to the welfare of small operators and assure their independence. We hope you will do everything within your power to have the Senate Small Business Committee continued in the Eightieth Congress.

GEORGE O. TOEPFER,
*President, National Association
of Master Plumbers.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 20, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Office Building:

Urge continuation of Senate Small Business Committee as the only Senate committee devoting its full energies toward problems of small business. Fear industries composed primarily of small business units would not receive attention commensurate with the importance if activities of this com-

mittee were to be merged with activities of other committees. Wish to record our support of this committee's work and urge its continuation.

RICHARD P. WHITE,
American Association of Nurserymen, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 20, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Office Building:

The National Association of Retail Druggists, representing approximately 31,000 independent pharmacists of the Nation, are vitally interested in maintaining the Senate Small Business Committee. To us this committee represents a court wherein the problems of small business may be presented. We trust that you and your colleagues will continue this committee; it is of vital concern to us.

GEORGE H. FRATES,
*Washington Representative, National
Association of Retail Druggists.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 21, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

United States Senate:

In response to inquiry the National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers, representing the men's-wear stores of the Nation, would be pleased to appear at a public hearing and urge the real necessity and importance of the continuation of the Senate Committee on Small Business as a practical means of protecting the men's specialty stores, who are truly small business.

LOUIS ROTHSCHILD,
Executive Director.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., January 21, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

*Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:*

We are informed that there is some opposition in the Senate to the continuance of the Special Committee on Small Business. Speaking for wholesale lumber distributors throughout the Nation, we desire to unhesitatingly testify that had it not been for the help of the Small Business Committees of the Senate and the House, these small firms would have been entirely eliminated during the period of price control, as only through the intervention of the Small Business Committees were we given any consideration whatsoever by OPA. We know our voice is weak, but hope you will call attention to this unsolicited telegram to all Senators, especially those from the South, and say to them that their support of your resolution will be gratefully appreciated by many of their friends at home who consider the Small Business Committee their best avenue of approach concerning all matters of Government affecting their welfare. Your committee has served the small business firms faithfully and effectively without regard to party affiliations or personalities. Our earnest hope is that the continuing resolution will be passed.

SOUTHERN WHOLESALE
LUMBER ASSOCIATION,
ROBERT F. DARRAH,
Secretary-Manager.

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL
CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Having been informed that you have introduced Senate Resolution 20, to authorize the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee, we desire to advise you of our hope that this resolution will be acted upon favorably by the Senate.

It is our understanding that, although this committee is concerned chiefly with the problems of the relatively small business enterprises, which constitute a very large proportion of our association membership, the committee is not antagonistic to the interests of the larger operators.

We feel sure that under your able chairmanship this committee will be in a position to solve many of the problems of small businesses which might otherwise be neglected or ignored, and we wish to assure you that if the committee is continued the facilities of our association will always be available to you to assist you in any matters concerning our industry.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. FOREMAN,
Managing Director.

JANUARY 24, 1947.

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
The Committee on Small Business Enterprises has rendered invaluable service to the American public and industry, including 20,000 retail neighborhood bakers. We hope the committee will be continued.

FRANK G. JUNGWAELETER,
Executive Secretary,
Associated Retail Bakers of America.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
January 13, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Press announces you have introduced resolution to continue Senate Small Business Committee. We endorse your resolution, as we are particularly interested in Subcommittee on Mines and Minerals.

J. K. RICHARDSON,
Manager, Utah Mining Association.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 10, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Mining Association of the Southwest, representing mine owners and operators throughout Southwest, respectfully urges Senate Small Business Committee be continued. Likewise we urge the mining and mineral industry subcommittee be continued and its activities expanded. This subcommittee has been most important factor in assisting small domestic mining operations.

VICTOR J. HAYEK,
Secretary,
Mining Association of the Southwest.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 13, 1947.
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are interested in the continuation of the Small Business Committee of the United States Senate and particularly the continuation of the Subcommittee on Mining and Mineral Industries. This recommendation is based on the constructive and material assistance given this company by these committees in consequence of which we were able to render outstanding service in the prosecution of our war effort by the production and supply of critical and strategic manganese. Furthermore since our plans are being formulated for the processing of low grade domestic manganese and chromium ores for the production of electrolytic manganese and electrolytic chromium. The assistance of this committee and its subcommittee will be of inestimable assistance in making these materials available not only to industry but also to our country in the event of another emergency arising.

A. C. BARKER,
President, Dominion Manganese Corp.

SAN MATEO, CALIF., January 14, 1947.
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The heated debates and long delay in improving your Senate Resolution 20 by the Senate is causing great concern among small businessmen. Comments being received from different parts of the Nation wanting to know if Members of Congress running for public office meant what they said from the platform last November when they stressed the importance of taking action to protect and promote small business. Last month we sent out 109,000 ballots to Nation-wide membership on issue of continuing Special Small Business Committees in House and Senate. A tabulation of the vote shows 93 percent for, 4 percent against, and 3 percent no vote. We sincerely trust you will convey to every possible Member of Senate that unless all possible action in Congress is taken to promote small business welfare the Eightieth Congress might be the last Congress to vote upon this important American principle. Continued failure to promote small-business security can result in a socialistic government. Best regards and wishes.

C. W. HARDER,
President, National Federation of
Small Business, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 23, 1947.
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As is well known the trucking industry is almost wholly made up of small businesses with only a mere handful of companies of the tens of thousands within its ranks of such size that they might be classed above that scale. May we take this opportunity to congratulate you and to inform you of our full support of your resolution which would continue the Senate Small Business Committee, which has done so much for this industry and other small business enterprises in the past.

JOHN V. LAWRENCE,
Managing Director, American
Trucking Associations, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 22, 1947.
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Retail Coal Association which is the national organization of retail coal dealers, is desirous of seeing the Senate Small Business Committee continued, as we believe they have performed a very useful service.

J. L. NEWBOLD,
Executive Vice President, American
Retail Coal Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 22, 1947.
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Chaotic condition of the war surplus program is just one of the many reasons for the reinstatement of the Senate Small Business Committee. We as the National Trade Association representing many small distributors of construction machinery Nation-wide, urge your support when committee reinstated. Request that surplus be placed in top position for study and action.

ED P. PHILLIPS,
Chairman, Associated Equipment Dis-
tributors' Committee on Disposal
of Government Surplus.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 22, 1947.
Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Twenty-five thousand retail building supply dealers represented by our association

are vitally interested in the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee. This committee, above all others, is conscious of the problems confronting small industry during the reconversion period. Please do whatever you can to continue this committee at least for another year.

H. R. NORTHRUP,
Secretary-Manager, National Retail
Lumber Dealers Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 22, 1947.
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D. C.:

This association, speaking for most of the considerable members of manufacturers of coated and processed papers, which are primarily small companies, urge without reservation that Senate Small Business Committee be continued. The committee has been of very real service to those small business manufacturers in respect to their special industrial problems.

ARTHUR A. THOMAS,
Executive Director, Coated and
Processed Paper Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 24, 1947.
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Candy wholesalers of the country recognize and appreciate fine work of the Small Business Committee, and we strongly believe the public interest will be served by continuing it.

C. M. McMILLAN,
Executive Secretary, National Candy
Wholesalers Association, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 22, 1947.
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate:

This federation strongly in support of your proposal to continue Special Committee To Study Problems of Small Business. Economic background of our country point to need for continued protection of small business which had been recognized as backbone of a successful economy. Urge all possible effort be made to reestablish this important committee.

LEO F. GENTNER,
National Federation of Apparel As-
sociations.

LINDEN, N. J., January 24, 1947.
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate:

Elimination of the Small Business Committee would be a great blow to small business. Where could we go to be heard? I urge you to continue this splendid committee.

A. E. SHILTON,
Vice President, Browning King Co.

GREENSBORO, N. C., January 24, 1947.
Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D. C.:

Service of Senate Small Business Committee in the past has demonstrated the urgent need for its continuance in the Eightieth Congress. In the interest of consumers and independent smaller enterprises urge your efforts to that end.

LEO J. HEER.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago, during the colloquy between the Senator from Nebraska and me, the Senator stated that there was no other way by which the work of the committee could be ex-

tended, than by creating an entirely new committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I said there was no other way, in my opinion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood the Senator to say that he had consulted the legislative draftsmen to determine whether any other way could be found than by the creation of an entirely new committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the Senator, he said the only way it could be done, to give the Republicans a majority, was by creating an entirely new committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no; the Senator did not catch correctly the import of my answer.

Mr. ELLENDER. I probably misunderstood.

Mr. WHERRY. I said that the parliamentarian stated that the committee could be extended, but, if it were done, it would be mandatory upon the President pro tempore to name the personnel of the committee, remove surplus Democrats from the committee, and place two new Republicans on the committee. I said I thought that would be embarrassing, and that the majority should have something to say about that matter. I was informed as I recall—I know the Senator will not question my word—that the only other way to accomplish the purpose was by the creation of a new committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was only trying to ascertain what the motive was.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the only motive.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the committee was extended during the Seventy-eighth Congress the resolution previously adopted was amended so as to provide for an additional 5 members, making a total of 12.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. The Democrats then had seven.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator desire to continue the members of the old committee as they now are?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I wish to say that as I understand—I may be wrong—ordinarily a special committee is appointed by—

Mr. ELLENDER. I am merely asking the Senator a simple question.

Mr. WHERRY. I will explain. It is my understanding that ordinarily a special committee is appointed by the President pro tempore, but he does not select the chairman. When the 12 members are named, they themselves meet and organize the committee. That is my understanding, and it will be perfectly agreeable to me that the President pro tempore appoint any Senators he wants to appoint as members of the committee. If in his wisdom he feels that the old personnel did a good job and he wishes them to continue, that is perfectly agreeable to me. I have not consulted the President pro tempore, nor the majority leader, and it is perfectly agreeable to me for them to appoint anyone they wish to appoint from this side of the aisle or from the other side of the aisle. I am not asking for the appointment of anyone.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is aware of what happened 2 or 3 years ago, when a resolution was adopted extending the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. Then the same personnel continued to serve. If the same membership is now appointed, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is the senior member on the Republican side, would be chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator knows why that is. That is the result of the election in November. The Republican side now has the majority.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but I wish to give the Senator the privilege of doing the same thing as was done when the life of the other committee was extended. May I suggest that if the Senator desired to continue the same membership the committee now has, he could simply move to extend the present committee, and increase the number of Senators on it from 12 to 13. By so doing it would give the Republicans a majority.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the suggestion, but I think we are merely talking about a technicality.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it is not a technicality.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my opinion that the distinguished President pro tempore will select the most able Senators he can for membership on the committee. I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that the Senator from Nebraska will be perfectly satisfied with whomever the President pro tempore may select.

Mr. ELLENDER. My suspicion is that the Senator wants a new resolution adopted so that he can be chairman of the committee, and not permit the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who is the ranking member, to be chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I knew the Senator from Louisiana would bring that out on the floor; I knew he would make that statement. He was not serious in the question he put to me at all. He wanted to bring out on the floor that I wish to be chairman of the committee. In the resolution I have presented I have not included such a suggestion. If I wanted to do so I would have incorporated in it a provision authorizing the President pro tempore to appoint the chairman of the committee and a vice chairman, as the President pro tempore did in connection with the Atomic Energy Committee. Such a provision was contained in the resolution dealing with that committee. I did not do so, however. I am perfectly frank when I say that no matter who is named to the committee I shall be perfectly satisfied. The President pro tempore can leave me off the committee and I shall be satisfied. I am interested in small business. I am not interested in personalities or in trying to get ahead, as the Senator from Louisiana has suggested.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; but I think I have seen quite a few articles in the press in which such a suggestion is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; in Drew Pearson's column.

Mr. ELLENDER. And we can make a pretty good guess about it.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; Drew Pearson; Drew Pearson!

Mr. TOBEY obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I suggest the absence of a quorum. The Senator from New Hampshire is going to say something quite worth while, and we should have a greater attendance of Senators on the floor when he speaks.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, as I turn and look around on this side I see Republican Senators present to the number of five or so. There are those few of the faithful. What I shall have to say might be useful; it might be stimulating to the minds of absent Senators; they might be interested; so let the quorum call proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Connor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Eaton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall speak very frankly this afternoon, using language to convey thought and not to conceal it.

There is sometimes, and too often, a wide and deep abyss between partisanship and government. The motivations behind partisanship may at times be different from the motivations behind the struggle for good government. As a Senate we are engaged in transacting Government business. One or both of the parties, or a group in one party or another in the Senate, may at times be serving their own partisan purposes, in doing something for the sake of a partisan group, contrary to the requirements of good government.

The country has just witnessed an example of the difference between votes in the interests of clean government and votes to carry out the program of a special group.

In considering this question it is not so important whether a group which succeeds in serving its partisan or special purposes, rather than the purposes of government, succeeds by a big majority vote, or just barely noses through by one vote, and by refusing to provide a pair for a Member of the Senate, who has been called away by serious illness in his family.

In this instance it was so clear that the program before the Senate was in the service of a special group, rather than of the country as a whole, that utmost pressure and effort could get them victory by only a mere hair's breadth.

Today the country is faced with the spectacle of a second attempt to break down the efficiency statute.

I should like to show how such major steps for the defeat of good government bring with them many lesser, though important, other defeats for good government. The record of the past 3 weeks shows a whole series of inefficiencies in the operation of the affairs of the Senate, at the very beginning of the Eightieth Congress.

The Eightieth Congress opened for the conduct of public affairs under bright auspices. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 had finally gone into effect. It provided Congress with the mechanics for efficiency. It gave us, to use the language of my colleague [Mr. BRIDGES], the opportunity to operate on a streamlined basis. We opened for business with full power to transact the public business competently.

Our Eightieth Congress has so far been subjected to incompetent operations. This is so serious that I feel it my duty to present in detail the cumulative evidence of the incompetent administration of important business to date.

Competence in the conduct of Government business is the least that the public is entitled to get from us. It makes no difference whether a Government body is run on democratic principles, or is run by a boss. Both ways, the minimum required is competence. It is well known that even some of the big city bosses present in their defense, the claim that they provide competent administration of government for their cities. Even foreign dictators have resorted to this defense to show that at least they do something for the people they rule. So it was that Mussolini was widely advertised as the man who made trains run on time. But in our Senate, in the last 3 weeks, our leaders have been running the train off the rails.

The insistence in our country on competence in any work, public or private, is in the long standing tradition of our people. It has been handed down to us from the earliest days of colonization in America. The earliest colonists know that they had to build their houses solidly. They expected from the cabinet maker a solid and durable chair or other article of household furniture. They expected from the cobbler a first-rate job of leather. They knew that slap-dash work was no good.

I think the record will show that the Senate in the opening days of this Congress has already been subjected to slap-dash work.

Inefficiency in the Senate in the Eightieth Congress has not been due to any lack of ability in the leaders of the party which controls the Senate at the present time. On the contrary, the ability of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] is such that he is renowned everywhere for talent, industry, and intelligence. The same may be said of others, who are taking part in conducting af-

fairs on the majority side at the present time—the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

In others, who have participated in the making of plans and the taking of action on the particular subject matter to which I shall refer, one will find also outstanding ability—for example, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. The country is getting, from the leadership of the majority party in the Senate, ability that is as good as the country can expect.

The causes of the incompetence, as a careful perusal of the record will reveal to any reader, are due to something else. A group which starts on the wrong road will blunder and blunder and blunder.

That I shall develop in the course of this statement.

I shall take, as the example, that which was made the No. 1 business of the Senate by the leaders of the majority in the Senate. Turn to the calendar of business of the United States Senate, which is on the desk of every Member of this body. What do we find as the first order of business under general orders? We find that the first order of business is the consideration by the Senate of Senate Resolution 20, a resolution offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska to create a new special committee having to do with small business.

What did we find as the second order of business? It was the consideration by the Senate of Senate Resolution 46, the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Maine for the continuation of the War Investigating Committee.

It is particularly appropriate to consider the inefficiencies in the operation of Senate business in the last few weeks, in connection with this latter resolution, on which the Senate voted on Wednesday, January 22. That resolution provides for an investigation of certain things in the executive branch of the Government—inefficiency, incompetence, and mismanagement. At the same time that we are engaged in throwing a stone, no matter how deservedly, against inefficiencies and incompetence in the executive branch of the Government, we should not be placed in a senatorial glass house of senatorial inefficiency and incompetence.

I shall now compare the inefficient methods used in the last few weeks in handling this first business which came before the Senate in the present Congress, with the long-established and efficient methods which have been used by the Senate in the past. A study of the record will show that in the course of the current major efforts to break down the efficiency provided by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, a number of older efficiencies which the Senate possessed, even before that statute was enacted, were thrown overboard.

A discussion of the conduct of business in the Senate is, to some extent, of a technical nature, just as would be the discussion of the conduct of business in the manufacture of automobiles.

Nevertheless, every intelligent person understands how the assembly line in an automobile plant functions. If you told an intelligent person that the manager of an automobile factory, without providing a satisfactory substitute for the established assembly-line procedure, ordered his men to scrap two or three of the operations for the preparation of parts, until the entire automobile was assembled, it would be clear at once that inefficiency had been substituted for sound operation in the conduct of the business of that factory.

There is a certain order of business in handling resolutions in the Senate. It is long established. The steps which are involved are the introduction of a resolution, the referring of that resolution to the appropriate committee, the careful consideration by committees of the issues involved, and the holding, if necessary, of hearings on those issues, the vote of the committees on those resolutions, the filing of a report to the Senate which conveys to the Senate adequately the reasons for the report of the committees, and deliberations on the floor of the Senate and the final voting on those resolutions.

That is the established way of doing business on such matters in the Senate.

Unquestionably, improved methods of doing business can be developed and should then be used. But it is a very different thing to throw overboard the established methods of doing business in order to substitute a mere slap-dash method—one which has not been carefully thought through and one which is bound to result in confusion, delay, inefficiency, and waste.

That is exactly what took place in connection with the two resolutions which the Senate has been asked to consider as its first order of business.

In outlining the established steps in the handling of business on such matters, methods which have been tried for decades and have been found the best way of doing such legislative business, I do not mean to say that the members of the majority party may not hold their own caucuses for the purpose of considering what they should do in connection with legislative questions. But this is additional to the appropriate action by the Senate and the Senate committees. When we legislate by passing a resolution or a bill and when our committees consider and report bills or resolutions to the Senate, that is done not in the name of the majority party of the moment, but in the name of the entire committee and the entire Senate made up of both parties.

Now let us see how the No. 1 and No. 2 businesses which have been placed before the Senate have been handled.

I am going to take, by way of example, five of the inefficiencies which have marked our course this month.

I want to repeat that I am discussing the question, not of efficiency in a partisan operation, but efficiency in the conduct of the affairs of the Senate.

The first misstep was the deliberate bypassing of the standing committees to which should have been referred the resolutions for the creation or continuation of the special committees under

Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46. The resolutions were sent directly, not to the committees which have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the proposed investigation, but to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Even the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] acknowledged on the floor of the Senate in the debate on January 15 that another committee than the one to which his resolution was sent had the primary jurisdiction.

I should like to read a few words from the discussion on January 13 on the floor of the Senate between the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] said:

I think I can show the Senate how the spirit of the Reorganization Act has been violated in this instance. Under the Rules of the Senate as they now exist, the creation of a special committee requires the submission of a resolution and the reference of the resolution to the committee of the Senate having jurisdiction of the subject matter. . . . In this instance, when the Brewster resolution and the Wherry resolution were submitted they should have been referred to the proper standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matters.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in the course of his ensuing remarks, said:

If the Senator wants to say that we are violating the rules of the Senate, that is another question; and I am willing, when the resolution comes up, to postpone it so that the situation may be straightened out in that respect.

We all know that since there was a violation, not only of the established practices of the Senate, but of the requirements of efficiency in the conduct of Senate business, the restoration to efficiency which the senior Senator from Ohio offered to make, should then have been made. We all know that this was not done, but that instead the supporters of Senate Resolution 46 wanted no such interference with their group purposes.

On the floor of the Senate on January 22, the senior Senator from Ohio recognized that there had been inefficiency in this first piece of business to come before the Eightieth Congress. He gave notice that he intended to introduce a resolution which would require that the efficient method of doing business should be followed in the future. That method has been followed for so many years, that no resolution was needed to protect the efficient conduct of business in the Senate from those partisans who arranged in advance to bypass the proper standing committees, and to proceed by inefficient and wasteful methods.

As I read the statement and the proposed resolution of the senior Senator from Ohio, it is in the nature of putting the Senate on notice for the future that no Senator should try to induce the senior Senator from Ohio to permit the incompetence, the inefficiency, and the mismanagement which were part of the program of the persons seeking to assure for themselves the creation of special committees, before the Senate in the Eightieth Congress even had a chance to look around and to realize what was being attempted.

The second example of inefficiency introduced into the affairs of the Senate in connection with Senate Resolution 46 and Senate Resolution 20 is related to the first. It has been part of the efficient handling of business in the Senate that, when a resolution for the creation or continuation of a special investigating committee is to come before the Senate for consideration, it shall first receive the views and recommendations of the standing committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter. As the senior Senator from Ohio said on January 13:

I think that any standing committee has a right to object to the creation of a special committee which will take jurisdiction from the standing committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the able Senator from New Hampshire that ordinarily if a resolution in the exact language of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska were submitted for appropriate reference, it would be referred by the Chair to a standing committee.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Maryland is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no doubt that it would go to a standing committee. Therefore, the resolution now before the Senate is only a subterfuge to take away from the Chair his right of correct reference. No other correct interpretation can be placed on the matter.

Mr. TOBEY. I so agree.

Mr. President, the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter knows a great deal more about it than does any other committee, and in particular it knows more about it than does the Committee on Rules and Administration, and therefore the committee which has jurisdiction is in a far better position to advise the Senate on the proper action which it should take with respect to the resolution.

There is another and even more potent reason for doing business in the long-established, efficient way. That relates to the subject of legislation.

Between investigation and legislation, there should be the least possible gap. Yet, when a special committee undertakes an investigation, there is a gap between its work and the subsequent work that will have to be done by the standing committee for the purpose of legislation. The special committee does not have the power to hold hearings on proposed or needed legislation, and, as the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said in the course of the debate on January 15, special committees are for that very reason weak.

When the Legislative Reorganization Act was under consideration in the Senate in June 1946, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] said:

I wished to refer to the question of special committees and the proper functions of our standing legislative committees. I think I am stating the fact accurately when I say that, in the case of most of our special committees, they have no legislative authority whatsoever, but are investigatory in character and in some instances are permitted to

make recommendations, and that is all. That does not relieve the standing committees of the Senate of the obligation of study and of reaching conclusions. In a sense, it involves a duplication of effort.

In view of this circumstance, a standing committee which will have to legislate on the subject matter of the proposed investigation should consider how wide the gap is likely to be between the special committee's work and the standing committee's subsequent work, and whether the labor of bridging this gap will be great or small.

This fact is one which the Senate must have before it, in order to judge whether a special committee should be created or continued. Even if it were true, as argued by the supporters of Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46, that there were any advantages in permitting a special committee rather than a standing committee to investigate certain subjects under Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46, it was essential that the Senate should be able to ascertain, from the best qualified sources, whether there were any offsetting disadvantages, and the nature and seriousness of those offsetting disadvantages. Only the standing committee could really advise the Senate adequately on this point. Certainly the Committee on Rules has no qualification, for that purpose, at all comparable with the qualification of the standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter of the proposed investigations.

The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] stated on the floor of the Senate that he had dealt with the Committee on Armed Services. But most of his dealing, as became clear in the course of the debate, was only with the Republican members of that committee, and was obviously for purposes of making concessions, in order to get his resolution through the Senate, rather than for the purpose of getting the Committee on Armed Services to tell the Senate all the considerations which it should have in mind in its deliberations on Senate Resolution 46. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] amply developed this point in the course of the debate, with a clarity that made his statement wholly unanswerable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Hampshire has already passed the point about which I wished to inquire. He was referring to the exchange between the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Committee on Armed Services. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from New Hampshire is saying that a trade was made, a surrender of jurisdiction by the special committee, in order to obtain votes to continue it?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from New Mexico puts the matter rather baldly, but I think it is rather near a bull's-eye.

When, in the course of this negotiating process, part of the jurisdiction which the supporters of Senate Resolution 46 wanted to give to their special committee had to be thrown overboard, and only part was left in their hands, there was still the question of getting the views of

the best-qualified standing committee with respect to the subject matter that was still retained under Senate Resolution 46. To be sure the supporters of that resolution were very much in doubt whether they could get that resolution through the Senate, as indicated by the refusal to arrange a pair for a Member of the Senate who had been called away by illness in his family. At that stage the supporters of the resolution were in a position where they could not negotiate with the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, because that would involve a surrender by the supporters of Senate Resolution 46 of the remainder of the jurisdiction which they sought to obtain for themselves.

In any event, negotiation for position, trading for jurisdictional power, bargaining for a piece of the jurisdiction which by statute has been assigned to a standing committee, is not the same thing as careful consideration by that committee of the merits and demerits of a resolution to assign jurisdiction to some special committee. The Senate is entitled to a careful report, from the standing committee, on the merits and demerits of the proposal for creation of a special committee. Instead, we witnessed simply a bargaining in the corridors and committee rooms and senatorial offices, and even that bargaining was conducted simply between majority party members of a special committee and majority party members of a standing committee. That does not permit of the type of consideration and reporting which one can expect to get from a committee, rather than from a partisan section of a committee that is not meeting in any respect as part of the Senate or as a Senate committee organization.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator from New Hampshire prefer not to be interrupted by other Senators?

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to be fair to those who also wish to speak, and my remarks will consume some time. However, when I conclude, if the distinguished Senator from Maryland cares to ask questions, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I shall not interfere with the very cogent address of the Senator from New Hampshire, except to say, while I am on my feet—and what I shall now state is not what I wished to say when I rose in the first place—that in my opinion the overwhelming logic of his entire argument is absolutely devastating to anyone who would support a special committee, in the face of the facts which the Senator from New Hampshire has so well developed.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator.

I simply wish to rise to make a correction in regard to a statement of fact about which I think my brother Senators are inaccurate, though I certainly do not infer intentionally so. The inference has been drawn that there was an arrangement between the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Republi-

can members of the Armed Services Committee. I am willing to say that at the first conference held between some members of the Armed Services Committee and the Senator from Maine, the chief purpose of the Republican members of the committee was to point out to the Senator from Maine that, as members of that committee, we did not look kindly upon an encroachment upon our power and jurisdiction, and we wished to know what limitations he was willing to place upon the purport and breadth of his investigation, if the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program were continued.

As a result of that conference, another conference was held, at which the Senator from Maine likewise was present, as were practically all the Republican members, and at least several of the Democratic members, of the Armed Services Committee. At that time the matter was most thoroughly and completely discussed, and an effort was made to arrive at some sort of limitation on the scope and breadth of the investigation which would be conducted by the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. The matter was discussed openly, fairly, and fully, with both Democratic and Republican members of the Armed Services Committee present, in an effort to arrive at a conclusion limiting the scope of the investigation.

As a member of the committee, Mr. President—and other than the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I believe I am the only Republican member of the committee present in the Senate Chamber at this time—I have felt constrained to make this statement. It seems to me that the Committee on Armed Forces needs no defense, but I have wished to make this explanation in behalf of the committee, in order to detail what actually happened, according to the best of my recollection.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for yielding to me.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Senate will now proceed under the unanimous-consent agreement, which divides the time from now to 5 o'clock between the proponents and opponents of the pending resolution. The time for the proponents is under the control of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and for the opponents under the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield time to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield time to the Senator from New Hampshire. How much time does he desire?

Mr. TOBEY. I should hesitate to say, not knowing what interruptions there will be, but I should like to make my address in continuity, in sequence.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield the Senator 30 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. "The quality of mercy is not strained," I may say to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. In the confusion I did not understand in whose time the Senator from New Hampshire is speaking.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire is speaking in the time of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what I have to say will take me but a moment. I am very glad that my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has pointed out that when the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] met with the Armed Services Committee, he met with the full committee, at least all members of the committee who had opportunity to attend, and there were some Democratic members of the committee present.

I am glad that the Senator from Connecticut also pointed out that there was an earlier conference held by the Republican members of the Armed Services Committee. I am sure that no one would question that the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] would have had greater difficulty in getting a majority vote for the adoption of his resolution had he not been willing to limit the jurisdiction of the committee so as not to encroach upon the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. I am convinced that he would have lost a sufficient number of Republican votes for his resolution if he had not made that arrangement.

The main point I desire to make on this subject is that I think that if such an arrangement was to be made in regard to one standing committee, it should have been made in regard to all standing committees. It is my position and one of my reasons for voting against the Brewster committee that if a fraud needs to be investigated, it should be investigated no matter where the fraud leads us. I think the arrangement made on the jurisdiction of the committee necessary in order to get votes to continue it was one good reason for voting against it.

I do think the Senator from Connecticut makes his point well when for the RECORD he makes the statement that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] met with the Armed Services Committee as a committee, and the Democrats as well as Republicans were present. However, the fact remains that most of the Democrats and a few of us on the Republican side did not approve of the principle inherent in the arrangement made for limiting the jurisdiction of the Brewster committee, which arrangement resulted in receiving a majority vote for the continuation of a special committee.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for the remainder of 30 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the third example which I shall present of the cutting of corners and resulting inefficiency relates to the unavoidable requirement that committees of the Senate shall do

their work thoroughly. This was true even before the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The Legislative Reorganization Act sought to give greater opportunity for thorough work by the committees, which means thorough work by the Senators who serve on committees. The Reorganization Act provides that, with a very few exceptions, Senators should serve on only two standing committees.

The Committee on Rules and Administration is such a committee. Ten of its 13 members have only two committee assignments and the other three have three committee assignments each. So on this committee, under the terms of the Reorganization Act, the members had been so limited in their number of committee assignments that they would be sure to have time to consider carefully every important matter coming before that committee.

Yet, on the important question of two resolutions, each of which has a serious bearing on the operation of business in the Senate, on the work of other standing committees; and on the reform statute of 1946, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration did the very opposite of that which the Senate has a right to expect from every one of its committees.

The committee held no hearings. It had no knowledge of the views held by the standing committees in whose jurisdiction belongs the subject matter of the proposed special committee investigations. In fact, the Committee on Rules had no knowledge of whether the standing committees had considered the subject and had as yet arrived at any view on the subject.

The Committee on Rules and Administration gave no notice to the public that it was about to consider those resolutions and dispose of them immediately. No one of the large number of Members of Congress, and of the large number of experts who have made through studies of the subject of committee work in Congress, was called on to present views or was given an opportunity to indicate whether he would want to present views to the Committee on Rules.

What happened in the Committee on Rules was stated by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on the floor of the Senate on the following day, January 10, 1947, and no member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has challenged the accuracy of what he then said. He said that, first that committee in its meeting of January 9 disposed of considerable other business. I now quote from his statement to the Senate:

Then, toward the close of the meeting, much to the surprise of some of us, action was taken on the two resolutions which have been reported by the Senator from Illinois to create special committees of the Senate. * * * Those of us who knew nothing about the resolutions and did not expect them to come up at the committee meeting requested they go over for a day of two—

A reasonable request—

so that we might give consideration to the major problem of whether or not the Senate should at this time attempt to wreck the

system of jurisdiction that had been imposed upon its various standing committees.

However, our request was very courteously but very firmly denied, and the majority of the committee decided to report the two resolutions immediately.

When a Senate committee refuses the request of the members of its own committee for time to consider a matter which they had not expected to come before the committee and refuses to do its job of thoroughly considering the merits of a resolution referred to it, there must be some especially and exigent reason for such a refusal. The need for speedy action must be imperative, because such a request of members of the committee is denied.

In fact, such was the confusion and mismanagement into which the supporters of the two resolutions were thrown by their attempt to substitute rush for efficiency that the Committee on Rules had almost an entire week in which it could have considered Senate Resolution 46, prior to the time when its supporters at long last wanted to have it even considered on the floor of the Senate, and at least 2 weeks before the supporters of Senate Resolution 20 had it up for debate.

Here is a lesson about cutting corners for partisan advantage. It introduces inefficiency, waste, and delay. We have proof positive in this instance that primrose paths are bad, not only for the conduct of Senate business, but also for those who would draw the Senate down such a path; the example that they have provided shows that they will trip themselves up.

They tried to rush Senate Resolution 46. They were stopped in their tracks by a revolt in their own party, a revolt against the attempt to steamroller one of the standing committees of the Senate. As a result, they conducted in the corridors and cloakrooms a substitute for business in committee and on the floor of the Senate. Meantime, they in effect were saying to the Senate, "Don't rush any consideration of our resolutions; we, the authors of these resolutions, are not ready; the Rules Committee was all wrong in thinking that it had no time to do its duty; the Rules Committee could have taken plenty of time; they could have done a good job rather than no job at all."

Negotiations in corridors and cloakrooms and elsewhere are permissible as an addition to the conduct of proper Senate committee business but not as a substitute.

I refer now to the record of our proceedings and its ample evidence of the unsuccessful attempt to rush the Senate, and the delays which the authors of the successful attempt to rush the Rules Committee thereby brought on themselves and on the Senate as a whole.

On the assumption that there was an emergency requiring the Rules Committee to throw overboard its duty of careful consideration of legislative proposals referred to it by the Senate, the time to begin debate in the Senate on the resolutions was at the earliest possible moment after the Rules Committee had reported those resolutions to the Senate.

That debate could have begun on January 10, when the Rules Committee hurriedly reported Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46 to the Senate. To be sure, objection could have been made by any Member to the beginning of debate on these resolutions on January 10. But such objection could hardly have been expected from the group which had rushed the resolutions through the Rules Committee, without giving it a chance to create even a pretense of careful deliberation. Yet, the attempt to begin and expedite debate on that and succeeding days came from the opponents of the resolutions, and the supporters of the resolutions were the ones who delayed and procrastinated.

On January 10 various opponents of the resolutions tried to open and continue the debate. The debate would have continued except that the proponent of Senate Resolution 46, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and others of its supporters stood in the way.

The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] several times intimated that debate was not appropriate on that day. Finally, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] made the point of order which brought the debate on the two resolutions to an end for that day.

It was expected by opponents of the resolution and by the entire public that the debate would begin immediately on Monday, January 13. In fact, on Friday, January 10, the junior Senator from Maine said:

I anticipate that on Monday, when this matter will be in order for discussion, there will be ample opportunity for the discussion which its importance merits.

On January 13, I presented a full statement in opposition to the resolutions. This was followed by some desultory remarks, and then after referring to negotiations under way between the junior Senator from Maine and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made this significant remark:

I trust that before the resolution comes before us there will be complete agreement.

Neither the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who introduced Senate Resolution 46, nor the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who introduced Senate Resolution 20, brought before the Senate on January 13 the resolutions they had respectively introduced. Neither of them, nor any supporter of either of these resolutions, asked that the debate begin on that day. They wanted to wait to have the subject come before us at some later date.

This brings me to the fourth example of the inefficiencies imposed on the conduct of Senate business, as a result of the attempt to cut corners in the effort to rush Senate Resolution 46 and Senate Resolution 20 through the Senate.

The committee system, as well known and as detailed in the reports of the Reorganization Act, was set up to get as much as possible of the work of the Senate done before the entire membership is called in. This is a screening

process, using the time of a small number of men to do all that can be done before the attention and energies of the entire membership are required.

We all know that when bills or resolutions are reported out of committee to the Senate, they may still be subject to amendment, and there may still be conferences in order to reconcile differences of opinions. But so far as possible, the efficient conduct of the Senate demands that everything that can be ironed out in the course of committee hearings and committee deliberations should be ironed out in committee. Otherwise, we will convert the entire Senate into one large committee which must take over all the business of the standing committees, and turn them into mere figureheads. The Senate will be unable to conduct its business efficiently or even to conduct its business at all, if the consideration of the merits of the proposed legislation, the ascertainment of what amendments, if any, are desirable, and the screening of the subject matter, are all transferred from the period of committee consideration to the period after the proposed legislation has been reported.

That is exactly what happened with respect to the two resolutions.

On January 13, the Senate was informed by the senior Senator from Ohio that the matter was in process of negotiation. Thereafter, on January 15, the Senate witnessed a strange and unusual and, I may say, mortifying spectacle. On January 15 it became impossible to debate any resolution which could be relied on as the resolution which was going to be urged on the Senate by its supporters. Five different drafts of resolution, amendments, and substitute amendments, each to take the place of its predecessor, were rushed to the floor of the Senate on that day. The resolution which was to be debated was not introduced until the close of the day, and was not even read to the Senate. So that most Senators did not know until Thursday, January 16, what "final" draft of the resolution was to be actually considered and debated.

We found that the business of Congress, which could have been done in an orderly manner, where all the press could have been present to see and to hear, was being conducted, instead, in corridors by press interviews. We found that instead of enabling the Senate to receive the views of the standing committees and enabling the Committee on Rules and Administration to receive the views of the standing committees which have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the proposed investigations, those views were reaching the Senate, as well as its Committee on Rules and Administration, through articles in the press. Even then, the views of the standing committees which have jurisdiction in the matter, and which are entitled to be consulted, were not being obtained. All that we had were the views of a chairman of one of those committees, or some individual members of one of those committees, or some of the majority members of one of those committees. There was a running around in little caucuses and little gatherings. Here was confusion worse

confounded. To be sure, a caucus of the majority members of one committee has a right to confer with a caucus of the majority of another, or with the author of a resolution, or with one or more of the leaders of the majority party. But that alone does not constitute the conduct of congressional business in a businesslike manner. This is topsy-turvy operation of the affairs of the Senate, with a vengeance.

One might be able to see some slight reason for disregarding the competent way of doing Senate business, if one could point to any satisfactory results. But all that one can point to is confusion, disagreement, dissension, and irregularity.

The Senate is a legislative chamber with a long history. The present standing committees of the Senate are consolidations of prior standing committees, also with a long history. We do not have to do what has been done on this No. 1 business of the Senate. We have been groping in the dark. We have been throwing overboard the established and successful ways of conducting the affairs of the Senate. We have been substituting slap-dash methods of conducting our legislative business.

I now present another example of the confusion, the inefficiency, and the explanations which do not explain, introduced into the proceedings of the Senate by the roundabout devices employed to achieve the undisclosed purposes for which the resolutions to create these special committees were introduced. I refer to the effect of all such inefficiency on the leadership of the Senate. They cannot admit that what is really involved is the creation of chairmanships for the faithful, and the indication to those who are not first in line that there may be more lollipops for others later. The consequence not alone on our present leadership, but on any leadership, is bound to be unfair to it, costly to its prestige as well as to the prestige of the Senate as a whole, and costly to the welfare of the country.

We should not conduct our deliberations and the business of the Senate on the basis of rewards to subleaders and to those whom it may be useful to draw into the fold of subleaders. We should proceed on the basis of logic and reasoning. When it comes to logic and reasoning, I yield to no man in my respect for the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who has been acclaimed by many as the ablest intellect, not alone in the present Senate, but in this Chamber for many years past. I yield to no man in my admiration for the intellectual capacity of others of the leadership in this Senate. Yet they have been placed in the position, by some of the faithful, of defending an indefensible blow at the efficiency statute, struck by indefensible inefficiencies in the procedures used for that purpose. In short, they are in an indefensible position. I can illustrate this fact by examples drawn from the arguments made on the floor of the Senate by the mind acclaimed as the ablest in my party's leadership in the Senate. The senior Senator from Ohio told the Senate in the course of the debate on Senate Resolution 46 that he

favors the principle of sending resolutions for special investigating committees to the standing committees which have jurisdiction of the subject matter—but. He said he does not like special committees—but. He said he voted for the Legislative Reorganization Act—but. I want to discuss some of those "buts."

He wants all the Senators to be put on notice, by a resolution he plans to introduce, that resolutions for special investigating committees must go not to the Rules Committee in the first instance but to the standing committee whose jurisdiction would be invaded by the proposed special committee investigation. He wants all the faithful to know, for the future, that they must not expect the kind of special dispensation and improper interference with efficient operations of the Senate that two of the faithful got as soon as the doors of the Eightieth Congress were open for business. It has not been the practice to grant such dispensations. Even in this, the Eightieth Congress, the general practice has been to refer resolutions for investigations to the standing committee having jurisdiction.

I have prepared a list of 14 resolutions introduced in the Senate up to the close of our proceedings on January 13, which demonstrate that even in this session in which irregular procedure on this point was attempted, the contrary, long-established rightful procedure has been generally followed. I ask that the list and other explanatory material on this point shall be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the foot of my remarks.

It has long been the practice to do exactly what the senior Senator from Ohio says shall be done in the future. Why not do it right now? On January 10 he said he would be glad to straighten out this irregularity, this impropriety, this violation of the efficiency requirements, when the resolution came before the Senate. I, therefore, ask him and the others in the leadership to send Senate Resolution 20 to the Committee on Banking and Currency now. As chairman of that committee, I promise them that I shall place this resolution as the first order of the committee's business. I shall ask the committee to give Senate Resolution 20 immediate, thorough, and careful consideration. I shall ask the committee to make a careful, thorough, and full report to the Senate with the utmost promptness compatible with the discharge of its duty to the country and to the Senate, the duty of careful deliberation and consideration.

Let me take up another one of the "buts" which stud the defense of the able and intellectually brilliant senior Senator from Ohio. He told us on January 13 that there is no violation of the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The purposes, the policy, and the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 are plain for every man to see. There are several aspects. One is the question whether there shall be a larger number of committees or a smaller number of committees. Every witness who discussed this phase of the matter urged that there should be a small number of committees. Every re-

port submitted to the Senate said that there should be a small number of committees. The statute itself specifies a small number of committees and names them.

Does the senior Senator from Ohio favor a smaller number of committees or a larger number of committees? That is a simple, plain, and clear issue on which Congress spoke in 1946, on which the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has taken a clear stand. Does the senior Senator from Ohio want to depart from this unmistakable policy adopted by the Senate in 1946?

Now, there is a second aspect of the policy, the purpose and the meaning of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The act was directed to the elimination of overlapping jurisdiction and duplication of the jurisdiction of the committees in the Senate. At that time there were a number of situations in which part of the jurisdiction of one committee was duplicated in another committee. That was one of the largest difficulties in the operations of the Senate. Against this, the press throughout the country, witnesses before the joint congressional committee, and the debates on the floor of the Senate directed vigorous criticism. It was one of the chief difficulties which the criticism and the legislation sought to eliminate.

Does the leadership of my party disagree with the spirit and purposes of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 on this point? Either they do or they do not. If we do not, then they cannot justify resolutions to create committees which duplicate to any extent the jurisdiction of committees already in existence. That is exactly what Senate Resolution 46 and Senate Resolution 20 do—they would grant to a committee to be headed by the junior Senator from Maine and to a committee to be headed by the junior Senator from Nebraska jurisdiction which was last year placed by legislation in the jurisdiction of committees now in existence, committees for whose continuance or creation no further resolution is required at all. The two resolutions that were introduced sought to duplicate committee jurisdiction. Those resolutions set up, in effect, a conflict of jurisdiction between committees.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TOBEY. I should be delighted to yield, but my time is limited, and I am under pressure.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to make a brief observation, which I have wanted to make many times during the debate. There has been a great deal of criticism of Senators who speak of the "spirit of the law" as though there was no such thing as the spirit of the law. I desire to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that when he speaks of the spirit of the law he is standing upon solid ground and is supported by rulings which have been recognized by the courts and the leading jurists of this country and of all other English-speaking countries since the sixteenth century.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, "the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I may say that it has been almost the unanimous decision of the courts of last resort that if there is a conflict between the spirit and the letter of a law, the spirit of the law will prevail. The Senator need not apologize to anybody for the position which he takes.

Mr. TOBEY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. President, these are two specific aspects of the policy and purposes and meaning of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. On these two specific phases—the question whether there shall be a larger number of committees or a smaller number of committees, and the question as to whether there shall be duplicated, overlapping, and conflicting jurisdiction of committees in the Senate, the Senate should take a stand. Either we stand with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 on those issues, or we take a stand against that act on those issues.

I come to the third of the "buts" which I have drawn as examples of the difficulty which one of the ablest minds in the history of the Senate experienced in defending the indefensible introduction of inefficiency into the affairs of the Senate. He now tells us that although he joined with the overwhelming majority of the Senate in voting last year for the reorganization bill, when it contained an express legislative condemnation of special committees, he cast his vote not for that provision, but only because there was much else of value in the bill. As far as I can remember, this is the first time that anyone has pronounced such a severe criticism of the senior Senator from Ohio. No one else has ever dared say that the senior Senator from Ohio would fail to point out on the floor of the Senate that legislation which he in general favored nevertheless contained a provision which he deemed bad. The debate in the Senate on the legislative reorganization bill ran for many days. The senior Senator from Ohio was there. He participated in the discussion and commended the legislation. Many other Senators proposed numerous amendments—for example, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was one of many who joined in supporting amendments. The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] referred early in that debate to the subject of amendments. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] asked numerous questions about the section of the bill dealing with special committees. Throughout, if my friend, the senior Senator from Ohio, had any doubts about that provision in the bill, he did not give voice to those doubts, a reticence which no other person would have dared openly charge against the senior Senator from Ohio.

But not only he and the others now leading the Senate but any and every leadership would find themselves in difficulties in any attempt to defend these resolutions, Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46. Their position really comes down to this: they tell the Senate that they do not like to have the standing committees by-passed when such resolutions are referred from the Senate, but they ask that they be permitted to do this wrongful action just once more. They say that they do not like special committees, but they hope that they will be permitted to undermine the Reorganization Act just this one more time. They say that they do not like any of the inefficiencies which have marked the course of these two resolutions in the Senate this year, but they hope that the Senate will indulge them in this little peccadillo just once more.

With many more of the faithful hoping for similar treatment for themselves, it is going to be interesting to see whether the leaders can withstand the demands by some of their followers for more of the same.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I have been given this limited time, and I should like to finish my statement. I am endeavoring to develop a continuity of thought which I at least think is worth while.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure what the Senator has to say is very much worth while. The only reason I rose and asked the Senator to yield was that I wanted to read into the Record at that point something which the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] said last year before the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, of which committee the Senator from New Hampshire was a member. It was during the debate on the resolution which was submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] asking for a considerable amount of money, which he did not receive because of the persistent opposition, primarily, from the Senator from Nebraska. This is what the Senator from Nebraska said:

Senator WHERRY. Just let me tell you, I supported the small-business appropriation because I felt that the showing was made that the Small Business Committee should continue as long as we have these Government agencies such as OPA and CPA.

Everyone knows they are now out the window for all intents and purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not going to inject myself into that.

Senator WHERRY. The same way with the O'Mahoney committee.

The CHAIRMAN—

And the chairman was the Senator from Illinois who is now addressing the Senate—

From the standpoint of permanency, the Small Business Committee could continue on forever, and probably do some good work.

Mr. WHERRY. I feel they ought to go on a permanent committee and not a special committee. The sooner you put them there, the more satisfactory it will be with me, if it is to be that long range.

I merely wanted to put that into the Record at this point to show the position

of the Senator from Nebraska last year when he was fighting practically all special committees and made the statement he did about the proposed continuation of the Small Business Committee. Mr. President, oh, how times have changed, one might say almost overnight, since the Republicans came into the majority.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

One impossible intellectual task has not yet been essayed by any of the Senate leaders, with the exception of the author of Senate Resolution 20. That resolution calls for the termination of the existing Small Business Committee and the establishment of a new small-business committee. Get that! According to the statements of the junior Senator from Nebraska in the Senate on January 13, 1947, when he was asked about this burial-and-birth procedure, the powers which his resolution would grant to the new special committee on small business are exactly the same as the powers of the existing special committee which he proposes to kill. Also, according to the answers given by the junior Senator from Nebraska, the committee he would create has exactly the same number of members as the committee his resolution would terminate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me? I will yield him additional time.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. In connection with the remark the Senator has just made, I wonder what the explanation is of the fact that Senate Resolution 46 continued the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program as it was in the last session, which automatically made the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] the chairman because of his rank on that committee, while the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 20, terminates the resolution under which the Small Business Committee was set up, and creates a new committee, which automatically eliminates the ranking Republican, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], from the chairmanship of that committee altogether? Can the Senator explain why that inconsistency exists between the two resolutions?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I am coming to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I am sorry I interrupted the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if the answers given by the junior Senator from Nebraska indicate the reason for terminating the existing special committee and creating a new special committee in its place, then the very same reasons are applicable in equal measure to the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense. If the junior Senator from Nebraska is right in the unusual method he has proposed in his resolution, then the junior Senator from Maine was wrong in the kind of method that he proposed in his resolution. If the method used by the junior Senator from Nebraska was as necessary as he says it was, then the failure to use the same method in the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Maine is bound

to get his special committee and the Senate into a mix-up, a jam.

On the floor of the Senate, there was some evidence that the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska had been prepared and rushed through with such speed that not even the present chairman of the existing special committee dealing with small business had been given an opportunity to acquaint himself adequately with the terms of that resolution. I submit that that is not the efficient way of carrying on legislative business.

The laudable purpose of aiding small business has been put forward as a screen behind which to carry out the less popular purpose of undermining the reforms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

I do not raise the question that persons whose statements confuse the issue in this way are aware that they are in fact promoting confusion, and have not thought the problem through with thoroughness.

Few, if any, people will disagree about the desirability of having an agency in the Senate that is concerned with the problems of small business and looking out for the interests of small business. Obviously, the best way to accomplish that result is by a permanent committee or subcommittee. Obviously, the thing to do is to have a subcommittee of a standing committee responsible for that work—responsible thoroughly, continuously, and constantly. If that is done, small business will not have to come to the Senate, hat in hand, every few months and have to ask for the creation or continuance of a small-business committee.

Let me say that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has already acted. On January 22, 1947, our committee, a standing committee, approved the formation of a subcommittee to deal with problems of small business, and I appointed a subcommittee of five. Three of those five Senators are now members of the existing special committee on small business. So, a majority of the subcommittee of this standing committee, appointed, pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act and the jurisdiction it confers on the standing Committee on Banking and Currency, to deal with the problems of small business, are men who have been and are members of the present special committee on small business.

The real reason for now trying to create a special committee on this subject through Senate Resolution 20 has not yet been stated in the course of the debate. It is fair to ask what lies behind this strange way of doing business. It is not clear from the explanation given by the junior Senator from Nebraska. He talked about the necessity of doing in this manner what he is trying to accomplish, because of the fact that the representation on the committee must be changed.

But why is not the same thing true of the War Investigating Committee, where the resolution of the junior Senator from Maine does not propose to kill the existing committee and create a new one, but proposes to continue the existing committee.

This whole method of trying to pass a resolution with respect to small business has been wrapped around in mystery by the very terms of Senate Resolution 20, the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska. If there is a clear reason for trying to do business that way, it should be stated clearly on the floor of the Senate. When the senior Senator from New Mexico, in the course of the debate in the Senate on January 13, 1947, asked the senior Senator from Montana, outgoing chairman of the Small Business Committee, about this curious way of doing business through Senate Resolution 20, the junior Senator from Nebraska obviously thought that the senior Senator from Montana, despite his long service as chairman of the committee, might not be able to answer the question. No one can give the real answer, without giving the show away. The junior Senator from Nebraska interrupted and said that he wanted to explain what it was all about. But he failed to explain it.

I challenge any Senator in this Chamber to show any word, any phrase, any sentence, any paragraph, any column, or any page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which the reason for this manner of doing legislative business, as proposed in Senate Resolution 20, is stated clearly, plainly, directly, and forthrightly.

The members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration considered Senate Resolution 20, and a majority of them voted to report it favorably to the Senate. But they have given us no explanation in any report or in any statement on the floor of the Senate for the curious method of conducting legislative business, arranged like a jigsaw puzzle, in Senate Resolution 20. Perhaps the present chairman of that committee or some other member who voted for Senate Resolution 20 will solve for us the legislative puzzle which has been deposited in our midst by Senate Resolution 20, and which no man has yet told us that he deems himself capable of solving.

I ask once more for the reason for subjecting the Senate and its committees in the early days of this Congress to irregular and wasteful procedures in the conduct of Senate business with reference to the two resolutions. Surely we are entitled to some clear explanations on this head. Lacking that, let me give the real motivation behind it all, and that was to provide a committee chairmanship for the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Nebraska. That, Mr. President, is reducing it to the lowest terms. But it is not good enough. The price is too high.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired. The Chair does not see the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in the Chamber.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am authorized to yield an additional 10 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Only yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio told me that last November those Senators came before the steering committee and pleaded the cause of special committees, before the Eightieth Congress was born.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. Not until I am through. I ask, why would they have come here and pleaded for the committees to be continued had they not known in their hearts that the terms and spirit of the Reorganization Act prohibited it? Surely we are entitled to some clear explanation under this head.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. When the Senator had the floor I courteously asked him to yield and he declined. I shall heap coals of fire on his head. I yield to him, provided he uses his own time.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I will resume my seat.

Mr. TOBEY. It makes a difference. The Senator is not a good trader.

In the case of Senate Resolution 20, the chairmanship is far removed from the aspirant to that office. He has to do more than get the Senate to vote for a special committee. He has to oust the present ranking Republican member of the present Small Business Committee from access to the chairmanship to which he would succeed if not ousted. So the present ranking Republican is steam-rollered out of his position, to make room for the Senator whom the leaders favor.

The Senator who is to be steam-rollered by Senate Resolution 20 introduced his own resolutions, to offset the threat to his position. But his resolutions have been filed away by the leadership in innocuous desuetude and remain, forgotten and unreported, while Senate Resolution 20 was hurried to the Senate from the Rules Committee so fast that no one had a chance to examine it in committee. Such procedure does not add to the prestige of the Senate or of the majority party.

One sometimes hears talk of party regularity. Regularity for what? To confer some benefit on the party in majority power? What benefit accrues to my party now in control of the Senate, from the creation of these special committees? The party will control all investigations, whether they are assigned to special committees or conducted by standing committees; the Republican Party has a majority in all the committees, standing, and special—if any special committees be created. So the party gains nothing from the creation or continuation of special committees. The only gain which accrues to anyone is to some individual who acquires a chairmanship, or to some other individual who gets a place on a special committee, conflicting thereby with some other Senator of his own party who has a place on a standing committee empowered by statute to investigate the selfsame subject.

So when there is talk of party regularity in these matters, it is not something for the good of the party in control, but for the gain of some individual. Many remarks about party regularity have been directed at me since my speech of January 13. There has been talk of party regularity requiring that Republican Senators shall remain silent about what is being done here. But that "regularity" is not something for the benefit

of the Republican Party. Rather it is an attempt to use the party to advance the interests of a few individuals.

There has been talk that regularity requires that Republicans shall vote for these special committees. Again, this is something to help individuals at the expense of the party.

There has been talk that discussion of these issues hurts the party. No; the damage to the party is at the hands of those who seek to use it for their own advancement, through the acquisition of chairmanships and the like. The airing of these issues by Republicans is for the ultimate, long-term good of the party. The public realizes that there are in our party men who adhere to principle, however much true principle is shunted aside for the moment.

I appeal to my fellow Republicans in the Senate to follow their own convictions, to refuse to follow those who are using the party for their own advancement. I appeal to my fellow Republicans to place our party before the people in the light which properly belongs to our party, not in the shadow in which a few men arrange chairmanships and other perquisites.

Speaking of party regularity, I call attention to one circumstance which will greatly interest the State of Iowa. The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] stated in the course of the debate that in the Rules Committee, of which he is a member, he refrained from voting in favor of Senate Resolution 20. That resolution in effect shoves to one side the senior Senator who represents Iowa in the Senate [Mr. WILSON], and in effect says that he is not fit to be the chairman of a committee.

It will be interesting to see how members of my party vote on such an issue and why they think that the smearing in this matter of the senior Senator from Iowa and the great State of Iowa is consistent with party regularity.

The senior Senator from Iowa is a distinguished public servant who has been honored by the State of Iowa in a long series of public offices over a long period of time. He attended rural schools and high school in Iowa. He attended Grinnell College in Iowa and is a graduate of the Law School of the State University of Iowa. He served as county attorney in that State and as district judge in Iowa. He was elected and reelected and reelected to the State Senate in Iowa. He was Governor of the State of Iowa for 4 years. He was elected to the United States Senate by the great State of Iowa.

And now there is pending before the Senate a resolution which would pointedly remove him and discredit him—this man who has been so signally and so justly honored by his own State.

I turn now from this digression. I am almost through. I turn from the discussion of the subject of competence and efficiency in the operation of the affairs of the Senate.

I should like to discuss one other problem raised by the recent proceedings with respect to the two resolutions to create or continue the special committee. Earlier in the course of this state-

ment, I referred to the importance of remembering that we are conducting the business of the Senate and Senate committees, and not merely of those members of the Senate and its committees who belong to the majority party.

I am a Republican, and I desire that my party shall be the majority voice in guiding the ship of state. But I do not wish its guidance to be in disregard of our form of government and of the principles vital to the preservation of our form of government. I would not see them harmed to the extent of one iota. I would not have our form of government subjected to a danger even as narrow as a hair.

Some of the committee and other proceedings with respect to the two resolutions, Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46, have involved occasional lapses so that it would almost appear as if only the Republicans in the Senate have anything to do with the business of the Senate, and the Democrats might be brushed to one side. I have already referred to the fact that unnecessarily the minority members of the Committee on Rules and Administration were given no opportunity to have a genuine participation, on the basis of actual study of those resolutions, although they urgently requested that opportunity, which was their right.

Similarly, when the standing committees which had jurisdiction over the subject matter were bypassed, and thereafter negotiations were undertaken with the chairman, or several of the majority members of those standing committees, this was more than a neglect of the Democratic members of those committees. It was really a substitution of activities by Republicans alone, for activities which, under the Constitution as well as under the rules of the Senate, belong to the committees as a whole and not to any one party in them.

And when, after a while, negotiations began between the author of one of these resolutions and the chairman of one of the committees which was bypassed, this was no proper substitute for action of that committee as a whole.

I refer to this matter because of the danger such procedure may bring in its wake. If the majority in power in the Senate on more than one occasion refuses to give the minority members an opportunity for adequate participation or bypasses them altogether, the way is clear for some person or small group in the Senate, of the Republican or Democratic Party, whichever happens to be in power at the moment, to begin to neglect and bypass the members of their own party in the Senate who refuse to be yes men. And once that stage is reached, it would not be long before a ruling clique would begin to brush aside those members of their own party who have been willing to be yes men.

Mr. President, it is better to have these problems out in the open, where the entire public can know about them and express their views on them.

In conclusion, Mr. President, once we get off the hard surface of the right way to do legislative business, onto the soft shoulders, we may end in the mire.

There is just one way of clean government in this matter. Stand by both the letter and spirit of the epochal legislation, the Legislative Reorganization Act, the La Follette-Monroney Act. Let us give it a chance to prove its worth. Let us march with the American people, who from one end of the country to the other have approved this statute, and expect of us and demand of us that we keep the faith.

I submit an amendment to Senate Resolution 20, in the nature of a substitute for it, and I will ask the clerk at the conclusion of my remarks to read my amendment.

Two principal differences between Senate Resolution 20, offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska, and my substitute deserve mention.

My substitute would have the subject of inquiry of small business remain in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, where the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 placed jurisdiction over such subject matter. The junior Senator from Nebraska proposes the creation of a new special committee.

The second difference requires some discussion. The resolution offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska would give his new committee \$50,000. My substitute amendment does not call for any appropriation at all at the present moment.

There are two serious objections to the \$50,000 provision in the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska. I speak on these points, out of the experience which I had as the ranking Republican member on the standing Committee on Audit and Control of the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. My fellow Republicans on that committee were the junior Senator from Illinois and the junior Senator from Nebraska. I am troubled that they should have taken the action they did with respect to Senate Resolution 20, one as its proposer and the other as the chairman of the Rules Committee, in approving the \$50,000 request in the face of the ample experience we three received on the Audit and Control Committee.

It was the practice of the Audit and Control Committee to examine requests of investigating committees for funds. We found that the old practice permitted scandalous use and waste of funds and that the old practice in and of itself amounted almost to a scandal. Under the old practice, an investigating committee would ask for \$5,000, or \$10,000, or \$25,000, or \$50,000 without making any disclosure such as is necessary in the proper conduct of public affairs and in the grant of public funds. We realized in the Audit and Control Committee that it was imperative, for the protection of the public purse, that any investigating committee which asked for money should give to our committee and to the Senate, and thus to the American taxpayers, a full and detailed statement of why the money was needed, how it was going to use the money required, the salaries involved, the number of days or months to be devoted to the work, the specific subjects of inquiry, and full details justifying every penny of the proposed expenditure.

Under the old, scandalous practice money was granted to investigating committees as the result of a deal, or a trade consummated in the cloakroom, or any back room. That method of doing business made for patronage, not for economy or efficiency.

Our Audit and Control Committee, on which, as I said before, the junior Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from Illinois were my colleagues on the Republican side, made great forward steps toward stamping out this practice and to substitute sound methods for the protection of Government money. We began to require full details from all investigating committees before they got their money, as well as after they got their money. Our progress was substantial, although the reform on which we were engaged had not been completed at the time when that committee came to an end, and the present Senate Committee on Rules and Administration took over these functions.

I am appalled to observe that the first action of the Committee on Rules and Administration constitutes a return to the old practice. If the junior Senator from Nebraska has any detailed information, such as should be supplied, let him produce it on the floor of the Senate. Certainly the present Committee on Rules and Administration under the chairmanship of my former colleague [Mr. Brooks] in safeguarding the funds of the Senate demanded no such details from the junior Senator from Nebraska, and received no such full explanation and justification as we would have required last year and in prior years from any investigating committee that asked for \$50,000, or even \$5,000.

The second reason for my omission, in my substitute proposal, of any request for funds at this moment, and for my criticism of the request of the junior Senator from Nebraska for \$50,000, arises out of a well-known fact about investigations. Those investigations which have continued for some years have collected a large body of data and documents, not yet introduced in hearings. For example, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Brewster] told us that his committee has 90 percent of its data. We have learned that at such a stage, it is practicable to analyze and put those documents in their logical order, and publish them without the necessity of formal hearings. Persons affected by the documents which are thus to be published are given full opportunity to offer any supplementary data they deem appropriate, and this also is included in the volumes published by the investigating committee. In this manner, the total cost to the Senate is reduced to \$5,000 or less, as against the \$50,000 or ultimate expenditure of \$100,000 necessitated by public hearings of the ordinary kind and by trips or junkets for any hearings conducted outside of Washington. For the spread or difference in expenditure of public funds, of anywhere from \$45,000 to \$95,000, the public gets no gain; only a committee chairman or others get the publicity which helps them personally, and the patronage involved in keeping people on the pay roll of the investigating committee.

Why did not the junior Senator from Nebraska ask for \$5,000 at this time? If his committee is created, and needs more money, they can get it. I want to see our investigations conducted effectively and thoroughly, and provided with all the funds they need for that purpose, but not to help someone's publicity and patronage needs.

At this time, as many of us know, some of the regular Senate employees, including some of the ablest, are being subjected to a pinchpenny policy. While this is being done to the regulars, are we to let special committees bring in irregulars and pay them as those committees, or more often their chairmen, may desire?

We require every department in the executive branch of the Government, every bureau, every division, every section, every smallest unit, to justify to our appropriation committees every bit of their proposed expenditure, with the most detailed agenda, budget, and details of every description. Can we do that successfully, and at the same time throw all such safeguards of the public purse out of the window when we give funds to a Senator or a few Senators to spend as they will?

If a small business tried to run its affairs on such a basis it would land in the bankruptcy court. So would a big corporation.

We have been crying economy, we have said we are an economy-minded Congress. While we distract the multitude with our breast beating and our speeches for economy, we are asked to take, as our first step, the road of lush and luxurious and unbudgeted and unscrutinized grants of large sums to some favored committee chairmen. We can spend every cent needed for a study of small-business problems, we can spend every cent needed for any and every worthy investigation, without profligacy and without those reckless methods which result in profligacy. Are we ushering in the era of economy, or a period when anything goes?

I shall ask that the material I mentioned earlier be appended at the close of my remarks, and that my amendment be read by the clerk. I have prepared numerous copies of my amendment, so that Senators may have copies before them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out lines 1 and 2, on page 1, and the first two words of line 3, on page 1, and substitute therefor the words "Resolved, That the Banking and Currency Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof."; strike out lines 1 to 16, inclusive, on page 2; strike out the digit "3", in line 17, on page 2, and substituting the digit "2"; and strike out the last three words in line 19, on page 2, and substituting the words "shall give all its data and information to the Banking and Currency Committee", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Banking and Currency Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of

research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

Sec. 2. The special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 8, 1940, as extended and supplemented, shall give all its data and information to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that his time has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will give the Senator 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire proceeds, will he yield for one question?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire in whose time is the Senator speaking?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] sufficient time to answer the question of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Do I not have a right to ask in whose time a Senator is speaking, when the time has been allotted?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Nebraska will not be charged with any time he does not yield to another Senator; so he need not worry.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think it ought to be made perfectly clear that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has appointed a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency to study the problems of small business.

Mr. TOBEY. The statement of the Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In the event the Senate should adopt the pending resolution, there will be a special committee studying small business problems, and a subcommittee of a standing committee studying the same problems. In other words, we shall have the very duplication of effort and overlapping of jurisdiction that caused the passage of the Reorganization Act. That was one of the major factors in bringing about this congressional reform.

Mr. TOBEY. And by that action we make a mockery of the Reorganization Act. I should like to say that on the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee are the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr.

TAYLOR] Three of them, or a majority, are already members of the Small Business Committee.

My amendment asks that the files and data be returned to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the supplementary material referred to a few moments ago by the Senator from New Hampshire will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Resolutions for investigation in 80th Cong. to close of session Jan. 13, 1947

Name of Senator	Number of resolution	Subject matter of investigation	Name of standing committee to which resolution was referred
Senator Downey (for himself and Senator Knowland).	21	Water resources.....	Public Lands.
Senator McKellar.....	26	Nashville newspaper acquisition.....	Judiciary.
Senator Lucas.....	29	Labor relations.....	Labor and Public Welfare.
Senator Morse (for himself and Senator Young).	34	Courts martial.....	Judiciary.
Senator Kilgore.....	38	Military discipline and justice.....	Armed Services.
Senator Morse (for himself and Senator Brewster).	40	Petroleum resources.....	Public Lands.
Senator Langer.....	41	Number of Federal employees.....	Civil Service.
Do.....	42	Cafeteria operations in Government buildings.....	Do.
Do.....	43	Classification of mailable matter.....	Do.
Senator Revercomb.....	44	Adequacy of coal car supply.....	Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Senator Reed.....	47	Adequacy of boxcar supply.....	Do.
Senator Baldwin.....	51	Sources of sugar supply.....	Finance.
Senator Morse (for himself and Senator Young).	56	Investigation of courts martial.....	Armed Services.
Senator Robertson of Wyoming.	53	Resolution to continue investigation of wool production, etc., by a special committee, and to obtain additional appropriation.	Rules and Administration.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the investigating committee involved in some of these resolutions was a special committee. Nevertheless in all but one case the resolutions were referred to standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter of the investigation, rather than in the first instance to the standing Committee on Rules and Administration.

The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], when he introduced Senate Resolution 34, proposed the creation of a special committee. But on January 13 he stated specifically that he desired to substitute a resolution for the purpose of requiring that the investigation he proposed should be conducted not by a special committee but by the standing committee of the Senate which has jurisdiction over the subject matter under the rules of the Senate. I might add, incidentally, that the exposition he gave of the reasons for avoiding the creation of special committees cannot be surpassed for lucidity.

After Senate Resolution 20, dealing with the investigation of small business, had been introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska and had been, at his request, referred to the Committee

on Rules and Administration, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] introduced two resolutions on the selfsame subject. The adoption of either resolution would have automatically ruled out the adoption of the resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska. Since he had already conferred jurisdiction over his resolution on the Committee on Rules and Administration, the competing resolutions introduced by the senior Senator from Iowa were also sent to that committee. But that committee reported out only the resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska and took no action on either of the resolutions on the same subject introduced by the senior Senator from Iowa. I might add that both Senators are members of the existing special committee on small business problems.

Two resolutions which do not call for investigations by any committee of the Senate have thus far been introduced and have been referred to the standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter rather than to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I present the facts on these two resolutions:

Name of Senator	Number of resolution	Subject matter of investigation	Name of standing committee to which resolution was referred
Senator Hawkes.....	28	Purchase of military installations.....	Armed Services.
Senator Wiley.....	36	International agreements.....	Foreign Relations.

The appropriate cases in which resolutions are referred, directly after their introduction, to the standing committee on Rules and Administration are illustrated in the transactions of the Senate to date.

Resolutions for amendment of the rules of the Senate are, of course, sent to that standing committee. Twelve such resolutions have been introduced up to the close of the session of January 13 and

all were referred to that committee—Nos. 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 39, 45, 49, 50, 54, 55, and 57.

In addition, resolutions calling for the payment of money for the expenses of Senate committees attending the funerals of former Members of the Senate and for the payment of compensation to employees or their representatives were referred to the Committee on Rules and

Administration. In this aspect of the work it is the successor to the jurisdiction of the former Audit and Control Committee. Four resolutions of this nature were introduced in the Senate up to the close of the session of January 13 and were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration—Nos. 22, 27, 37, and 48.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not desire to occupy the time of the Senate at this time if the Senator from Nebraska has in mind a Senator on his side who would like to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In whose time is the Senator speaking?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. I wish to extend every proper courtesy. Inasmuch as the Senator from New Mexico is on his feet and had addressed the Chair, I am glad to have him proceed and to use his time now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me inquire how the time stands at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has 42 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has 90 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, unless the Senator from New Mexico wishes to proceed at this time, I suggest that the Senator from Nebraska use some of his time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall reserve my time until later. I wish to show every courtesy to the Senator from New Mexico, who already has addressed the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska desire to use some of his time now?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I shall reserve my time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from New Mexico has now taken his seat. So I suggest that the Senator from Nebraska use some of his time now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that no Senator now asks me to yield time to him, I shall reserve my time until later.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To which side shall the time required by the quorum call be charged?

Mr. LUCAS. If the Chair rules as did the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] the other day, the time required by the quorum call will be charged equally to the two sides. That very question arose the other day at the hour of 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, half of the time required for the quorum call will be charged to each of the two sides; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Buck	Cooper
Baldwin	Bushfield	Cordon
Ball	Butler	Donnell
Barkley	Cain	Downey
Brewster	Capehart	Dworshak
Bricker	Capper	Eastland
Bridges	Chavez	Eaton
Brooks	Connally	Ellender

Ferguson	McCarran	Robertson, Va.
Flanders	McCarthy	Robertson, Wyo.
Fulbright	McClellan	Russell
George	McFarland	Saltonstall
Green	McGrath	Smith
Gurney	McKellar	Sparkman
Hatch	McMahon	Stewart
Hawkes	Magnuson	Taylor
Hayden	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Hickenlooper	Martin	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Maybank	Thye
Hoey	Millikin	Tobey
Holland	Moore	Tydings
Ives	Morse	Umstead
Jenner	Murray	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	Watkins
Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor	Wherry
Kem	O'Daniel	White
Knowland	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Langer	Pepper	Williams
Lodge	Reed	Young
Lucas	Revercomb	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. To whom does the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as a rule I do not like to indulge in what might be termed a post mortem. Day before yesterday the Senate voted to continue the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. During the course of the debate many things were said about that committee, and many things were said about Senators who had no knowledge or information about the committee, its origin or its work. Now today, at the beginning of the discussion of the pending resolution, which is akin to the one the Senate adopted day before yesterday, I wish to refer to the origin and history of the so-called Truman committee. It has been referred to in the Senate as an investigating committee as though it had been designed and created to inquire into fraud and corruption in war contracts.

Mr. President, I was a member of the Truman committee. For 4 years I served with the distinguished Senator who was the first chairman of that committee, the man who is now President of the United States. My service did not begin immediately with the organization of the committee, but it did begin within a month or so afterward.

It has been said the committee was organized during the war. That, Mr. President, is not accurate. I may say in passing that our former colleague, the then Senator from Missouri, Mr. Truman, long before the war, many months before Pearl Harbor, realized that danger was approaching and that the war which was raging abroad would without question involve this country, and, being a man of military experience, having served as captain of artillery in the First World War, Senator Truman wanted to serve his country. It is a matter of common knowledge that he offered his services for active duty to General Marshall, and that General Marshall, diplomat that he was, and is, declined the offer, saying that Senator Truman could better serve his country in the

Senate. Senator Truman laughingly said that General Marshall was most kind. The truth of the matter was that Senator Truman was too old to serve as an active officer in the war, and for that reason his services were declined.

Being a man of determination, of altogether patriotic design and motive, Senator Truman studied and thought as to how he could best serve his country. He came to the conclusion that there was a necessity for a Senate committee to be constituted to serve in the national defense. I emphasize the words "the national defense," because that was the name of the committee and service in the national defense was its purpose.

It may be asked why Senator Truman did not seek to have the Committee on Military Affairs conduct the study and research and undertake the work which his special committee was authorized to cover. I think I may say I had the confidence of Senator Truman, and that I can answer that question accurately, because we discussed it many times.

At the time Senator Truman offered his resolution, the Reorganization Act had not been passed. Jurisdictions of standing committees had not been defined, standing committees had not been consolidated, and Senator Truman knew that if the Committee on Military Affairs attempted the investigation and the work, there would be conflict with the Committee on Naval Affairs. So he conceived the idea of a special committee, with jurisdiction authorized by the Senate, to investigate into, and to strengthen, if you please, the war effort.

Mr. President, that was the purpose of the Truman committee, and that was the reason why it was authorized. I regretted to see the incoming chairman of the committee surrender and throw away, as he did, the main purpose of the Committee on the National Defense. I make no charge, but it is perfectly obvious that the amendment limiting the jurisdiction of the special committee to expenditures was offered in order to obtain the necessary votes to continue the special committee. In my opinion, those who advocated this change went too far. I believe the surrender was too great. I think they gave away jurisdiction which the special committee should have if it is to function as a true investigating committee.

Let me give one instance in point. Members of the committee, I am sure, will bear me out in the statement I am about to make. When I was a member I insisted that the special committee devote a great deal of its time and a great deal of its talent to investigating the disposal of surplus property which arose from the war effort. That is an essential part of the committee's activities if it is to be continued. Yet under the limitation of authority which has now been imposed on it, I do not think the committee can do that work. It is not involved in a question of expenditure at all, and the proponents of a continuation of the committee have surrendered one of the most valuable functions and parts of their jurisdiction.

Mr. President, the Senate has already acted on and adopted the resolution; it

has already authorized the continuation of the special committee. I think its jurisdiction should be sufficiently broad and sufficiently strong to enable it to do good work. So if the Senators on the committee will study their resolution, and the limitation which they themselves proposed, and come here and say, "We gave away too much jurisdiction"—as they did, if they are to do good work—"and we want to broaden our jurisdiction at least so as to take in the question of surplus property," I shall vote for such an extension of authority, because if the Senate is to have a special committee, the special committee should be a good committee, it should be a strong committee, and it should not be hampered or hindered by restrictions upon its jurisdiction.

So I suggest to the members of the majority party that they come forward and frankly say, "We went too far; we gave away too much jurisdiction. We would like to have our jurisdiction extended." If they will do that, I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator referred to surplus property. Was he referring to the investigation of the disposition of surplus property?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. If he was, I should like to advise him, as well as the Senate, that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has already made arrangements, under the authority granted it by the law, to make a comprehensive investigation of the disposal of surplus property, and the able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is the chairman of the group which will make the investigation.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator. I am very happy to have that information from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, but that is merely one more example of what is taking place in the Senate now in violation of the Reorganization Act. I do not think the Committee on Expenditures has jurisdiction of the subject we have been discussing, but it is immaterial whether it has or not. I know the special committee will very likely go into that subject, and, as was pointed out awhile ago, we are going to have two or three committees investigating the same subject, going over the same matter. That is what I meant when I said it was in violation of the spirit and intent and object of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator, although I am speaking under a limitation of time.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is vested with the authority to do this work under the law, and there will be no need whatsoever for any other committee to undertake to duplicate the work which our committee is going to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for merely one remark?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to advise the Senator that it is the purpose of the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to cooperate with the House Committee on Executive Expenditures, so there will not be a duplication, but the work will be done jointly, as if by one committee.

Mr. HATCH. As I have said, Mr. President, I do not desire to argue matters of that kind. The inadvisability of designating special committees has already developed. There is no question about what was intended by the Legislative Reorganization Act. That has been debated so long and so effectively that it is hardly necessary to renew the old arguments. But as a lawyer and as one who has made some study of and research into the terms of the Reorganization Act and into the general law covering the subject, I should like to have the opportunity of standing before a court, arguing the intent and purpose of the Reorganization Act, and obtaining an unbiased and unprejudiced opinion from men trained in the law, whether or not special committees are authorized or intended by that act. I should welcome such an opportunity.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, Senators speak glibly—and I use that term inoffensively—as though no Reorganization Act had been passed. They do not realize that a complete revolution has occurred in the rules of the Senate. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman of the steering committee, argued that it had been the custom in the past to set up special committees, and he enumerated as, I recall, about four. Of course that had been the custom. Of course it had been done. Of course the Democrats had done it during the time they were in power; but those were the very evils at which the Reorganization Act was directed. Can there be any doubt about that, Mr. President? Any person who reads the debates that took place, who reads the reports of the committees, who reads the newspapers, knows that that was what was intended.

The committee work of the Senate has been so heavy throughout the years that, under the old rules and the old practice, none of us could properly discharge our duties on all the committees to which we had been assigned. It was to get away from that evil, to get away from that very condition, that the law was passed and the limitation provided that no Senator should serve on more than two committees, with the exception of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, whose members might serve on three committees.

One may argue until he is black in the face that it was not intended to do away with special committees, but nevertheless reason and intelligence and knowledge of the conditions that existed all must lead to the conviction that it was the intention that Senators should serve upon two committees only. Whether they be

standing committees or whether they be special committees the result is the same. If a Senator served on two standing committees and on five special committees—which I understand is contemplated—there would recur the same old evil which resulted from the former practice, and nothing would have been accomplished through the passage of the Reorganization Act except to increase the salaries of the Senators themselves and to create for themselves a retirement fund.

Perhaps, Mr. President, those are harsh words. They are plain words, and I speak what I believe to be the absolute truth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield further time to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 5 minutes more to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I could not finish what I might say on this subject in 5 minutes or 50 minutes. I think probably I should now conclude my remarks and let some other Senator take the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I respectfully submit to the Senator from Nebraska, inasmuch as he has an hour and a half and I have, I think, about 22 minutes only, that he use some of his remaining time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] would now like to take 10 minutes of the time allotted to this side, if that is agreeable.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is very agreeable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska yields 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I do not know that I shall consume 10 minutes, but I have some very definite views on the pending resolution. Reference has been made to the activity of the Republican steering committee and what happened there, and likewise to the impropriety, as alleged, of submitting and urging the adoption of this resolution, because of the Congressional Reorganization Act.

I wish to assume my full share of responsibility in both instances. I was on the committee that helped draft the Reorganization Act, and I am a member of the Republican steering committee. I was glad to be recorded as being in favor of continuation of the Small Business Committee. That committee was brought into being as a result of the war. It was established as a result of the necessities of war channeling into big business the greatest opportunity to control the industry of this Nation that has ever occurred within my entire lifetime.

When I hear the Democrats on the other side, or Republicans on this side, complaining because Republicans wish to continue the Small Business Committee, I desire to remind every Member of the Senate that ever since 1932 I have heard the deluge of propaganda that came like the rain, year in and year out, charging that the Republican Party represented only big business. We were charged constantly with representing the "upper 10 percent." There was a theme that was followed in the press, on the platform, on the radio—everywhere—that the Republican Party represented the "upper 10 percent," the "well-entrenched minority," "the earls of privilege," "the barons of finance," the "60 families," the "200 corporations." Now, when the Republican Party, and I as a member of the steering committee, taking my share of the responsibility, wish to continue the fine activity of the Small Business Committee, it is amazing to see those on the other side solidly desiring to stop us from representing and giving small business its ample opportunity to have a forum where it and the myriad businessmen who conduct it may come to present their cause.

Why should there be a special committee for that purpose? I would state this as my reason—that during the war it was the big corporations that the Government supported. The Government gave to big corporations any number of millions of dollars to increase their plants. The Government constructed their buildings; it supplied their machinery; everything was channeled through the big corporations of the country to speed war production. Who got hurt? It was the little corporation, the small business, bound up in edicts, and directives, and regulations, and restrictions, and restraints, and rationings. Through the channeling of available material small business was tangled and strangled. Then the small corporations, the small businesses of the Nation, said, "Give us a voice. Give us a forum where we may be heard."

No standing committee could have represented or could have heard their cause. We set up, under the then majority leadership, when the Democratic Party was in the majority, this special committee. We supported the Special Small Business Committee, so that the small companies could come to the Nation's capital and not be forced to appeal to individual Senators or to the limited jurisdiction of any one committee, but could go to a committee set up for their protection, where they might present their cause. So long as the administration hangs on to the wartime regulations and restrictions, and so long as there are the bureaus still issuing their edicts and their restraining orders, it would be better to keep this committee alive, if we are going to keep small business alive in America.

That is my reason for wanting this special committee to continue. I do not want it to continue forever, but I believe it should continue until we change the bureaucratic policy of retaining war controls on small business in America. No standing committee can hear all the complaints that small business may have to make, but the special committee has

done an excellent job. That was while the majority of the committee represented the other side of the Chamber. I say that now is the time for the Republican Party to represent the small business of the Nation. It ill befits the party which has condemned the Republican Party all these years for representing what they call property rights instead of human rights, big business instead of small business, now in effect to say, "No, we do not want to let you Republicans go forward with this work and represent little business, to erect a forum where the little businessmen of America may present their case."

When the vote is cast today we will ascertain who stands for the survival of that life blood of America—small business. Small business cannot have the benefit of machines and buildings we paid for with Government money. Small business is not large enough to buy them.

In the last 15 years, under the Democratic regime, industry has become more concentrated and powerful than at any other time in the history of America. I for one, Mr. President, want to assume my full responsibility as a member of the Republican Party, as a member of the steering committee, and as a member of the committee which drafted the Reorganization Act. I hope the special committee shall be permitted to live and to function.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has 19 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had 42 minutes a while ago and yielded 20. What has become of the other 3 minutes?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They were used for the calling of the roll to establish a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was the calling of the roll for a quorum taken out of my time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That time was divided half and half.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not complaining. I may not even use the 19 minutes I have.

It is interesting to observe the reason given by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] for his enthusiasm for the continuance of this committee—not the continuance of the committee by the way, but for the creation of a new committee. I do not know whether his enthusiastic advocacy of this particular resolution will absolve him or his associates from any responsibility for heretofore being too friendly to big business. I am not concerned about that. If it does, well and good. But I have not yet had a sufficient answer to satisfy me as to why the two resolutions which have caused so much controversy in the Senate during the last 2 weeks were not based upon the same idea. Those of us on this side of the Chamber, and on the other side also, who have opposed these resolutions, as I have undertaken to point out heretofore, have not done so on account of any fear or any desire, ulterior or otherwise, to conceal something from anybody.

I do not wish to indulge in any partisan references, but constantly the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from

Ohio [Mr. TART], who seems to be entering a beauty contest of some kind, judging from the reports in the newspapers the last day or two, as between Republican pulchritude and Democratic lack of it, have constantly intimated that there is something ulterior in our attitude on this side of the aisle in regard to these resolutions. I do not think it can be correctly stated that the party which had the majority in the Senate for so long, and which initiated and inaugurated all these committees and all these investigations, the result of which is well known, has now suddenly been overcome with fear and trepidation lest something may be revealed.

In Senate Resolution 46 the Republican majority continued the existing Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. They did not create a new committee. They did not fire the old committee, as they are doing in this resolution with respect to the old Small Business Committee. They extended its power and thereby automatically provided that the chairmanship of that committee should go to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

If the Republican majority had done the same thing with respect to Senate Resolution 20 and had continued the Small Business Committee, automatically the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] would have become the chairman of that committee. But in order to get around that, in order to sidetrack him, in order to shelve him as the chairman of the committee, which he would have become if it had been continued, they propose to abolish that committee and create a new one with the understanding that the author of the resolution will be the chairman of the committee. The usual custom followed here is that when a committee is created the author of the resolution creating it is made the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, probably it is regarded as none of my business as to who should be chairman of the committees of the Senate when the majority on the other side will determine that matter. I am not mentioning it in order that I may have any influence or any control over that matter, because I have no such intention or purpose; but there is not a finer type of gentleman in the Senate of the United States than the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. Why should he have been sidetracked? Why should this legislative legerdemain, to use no worse term, have been indulged in in order to get rid of him as the automatic chairman? It may be a matter wholly within the jurisdiction of the present Republican majority, but nevertheless it is a matter of some curiosity to me. If there is any other reason why the existing Small Business Committee should not have been continued, I have not heard it. I doubt whether we will. So much for that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield briefly.

Mr. HATCH. I have heard it rumored that there were too many Democrats on the Small Business Committee as now constituted; that the Republicans would

not have had a majority, and, therefore, in order to get rid of the Democrats on the committee it was necessary to create a new committee. That is mere rumor and gossip. I do not know whether it is true. I am authorized, however, by at least two or three Democratic members of the Small Business Committee to say that they would have been perfectly willing to have resigned so as to have given the Republican Party its necessary majority on that committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the absence of any satisfactory explanation for the different treatment of this committee from that of the other, the reason offered by the Senator from New Mexico is as logical as any other that has been given or probably that could be given. So much, Mr. President, for that.

The Senator from Nebraska has offered an amendment to his resolution modifying it by limiting the committee in time to 240 days as I recall. I suppose he was attempting to approximate 8 months. I do not know whether it occurred to him or not, but it seems to me that if the resolution is to be adopted it ought to provide that the life of the committee shall end when under the Reorganization Act the first session of the Eightieth Congress must end, not later than the 31st day of July. Under the Reorganization Act, unless the Nation is engaged in war or there is an emergency declared by the President, the sessions of Congress automatically terminate on the 31st day of July. I see no reason why, even if this committee is continued, or a new one is established, it should go beyond the session of Congress in which we are now engaged. I offer that as a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska, in the matter of fixing the time.

The resolution requires the committee to report to Congress its findings and recommendations for legislation; but after it has made its findings and recommendations it cannot report a bill to the Senate. Whatever legislation it recommends must be properly introduced and then referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The special committee is not a legislative committee. It cannot report a bill. It may make a recommendation for legislation, but it cannot report a bill; and no bill introduced can be referred to it. Every proposal for legislation recommended by the committee at the termination of its life must then be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the Senator from New Hampshire is chairman. That committee must then consider the legislative proposal, taking advantage of whatever information the Small Business Committee may assemble. But it must consider the legislation *ab initio*. It may hold additional hearings. If a bill dealing with small business were introduced while the Committee on Small Business was still in existence, under the rules that bill would have to be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, even though the bill were introduced before the Committee on Small Business had reported.

The Committee on Small Business, as proposed to be established, could not lend money to any small business enterprise. That is the function of the Reconstruc-

tion Finance Corporation, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency in regard to legislation. The Committee on Small Business could not enforce the antitrust laws against large combinations which are seeking to drive small business out of the field. Legislation on that subject would go to the Committee on the Judiciary. The enforcement of the antitrust laws now upon the statute books is a problem of the Department of Justice, or the Federal Trade Commission, under certain circumstances, when matters are brought before that Commission.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. That is one of the things which has impressed me. At least half a dozen committees or agencies are required in order to handle the jurisdictional problems of small business.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Small Business Committee cannot be a part of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. STEWART. Neither can subcommittees of the standing committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. Neither can the Small Business Committee act on legislation. It can only submit a report recommending legislation, and its report and recommendation must go to some standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. That is true. There are several other committees which would have to make separate reports.

Mr. BARKLEY. It all depends upon the legislation proposed. I suppose from now on antitrust legislation will go to the Committee on the Judiciary. Legislation undertaking to help business, or to make loans to business through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the Commodity Credit Corporation, or any other agency for lending money, must be handled by the Committee on Banking and Currency. No matter what the special committee might report, the legislation would have to go to the Committee on Banking and Currency for consideration. Inasmuch as that committee must consider legislation, inasmuch as no committee of the Senate can take charge of an executive department and become a part of the executive branch of the Government, and inasmuch as all investigations are theoretically based upon the idea that legislation will come out of them, why not refer such questions to the committee which must deal with the legislation? It seems to me that the position taken by the Senator from New Hampshire, who is the very active, able, and conscientious chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is eminently sound. It has been my pleasure to serve with him on that committee for a long time. I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from New Hampshire by saying that in the consideration of all questions which have come before the Committee on Banking and Currency he has taken a broad, American, statesmanlike view of them, without regard to partisan differences. I have faith enough in him to believe that he will continue that course. It is the proper course for the great Committee on Banking and Cur-

rency, which is more economic than political in its make-up, its thought, and its jurisdiction. For that reason I shall vote for the substitute offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Six minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield if the Senator from Missouri will be very brief.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall try to be brief.

I observe that in his proposed substitute the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] authorizes the Committee on Banking and Currency "to study and survey by means of research all problems of American small business enterprises." However, I understand that the Senator from Kentucky, who proposes to support this amendment, has indicated that various subdivisions of the problems of American small business would go to numerous subcommittees of the various standing committees—perhaps the Committee on the Judiciary, perhaps the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and perhaps other committees which might be mentioned. Does the Senator from Kentucky consider that all the problems of American small business enterprises, to use the language of the Tobey amendment, belong to the subject matter embraced in the description of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as outlined in the La Follette-Monroney Act?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator had been listening to me he would have heard me say that, so far as the antitrust laws are concerned, or any amendments thereto, dealing not only with small business but with any business, such questions would come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has always handled such legislation. Of course, the resolution would authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate all phases of small business. When it comes to actual legislation it would have jurisdiction of only that part of the legislation set out in the rules.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Tobey proposal provide for a study and survey of all the problems pertaining to American small business enterprises? In the judgment of the Senator, does not a very large part of the problems of American small business relate to problems other than fiscal problems, which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency? I can give numerous illustrations if the Senator desires.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not time for the Senator to give numerous illustrations. I suppose the Senator from New Hampshire had in mind that while the Committee on Banking and Currency should have jurisdiction under his resolution to investigate all subjects connected with small business, that committee would report only such legislation dealing with those subjects as the committee had jurisdiction to report, and it would not undertake to invade the jurisdiction of other committees.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator if he will be kind enough to yield for a further question along the same line?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator has yielded to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Nebraska will yield a little time, I shall be glad to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. That will not do me much good.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator when I had only 6 minutes remaining, on the condition that he would ask a brief question. He has not complied with that requirement.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall try to comply with the requirement of brevity.

I ask the Senator whether it is a fact that in the Tobey resolution or amendment there is no limitation whatsoever as to the scope of the legislation with respect to which the Committee on Banking and Currency is to make recommendations. In that connection I read this language—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I know what the amendment provides. I have read it; and I am sure that the great constitutional lawyer from Missouri can understand it as well as I can. It will not be necessary to explain it.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate the compliment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that what the Senator says is true, that it is an omnium gatherum, a sort of grab bag of investigation. It does not increase the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency to report legislation, which is its function.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I decline to yield further to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me point out to the Senator from Kentucky that, regardless of the argument made by the Senator from Missouri, which I think is a sound argument, either of the two committees could go into all phases of the problems of small-business enterprises. But when the time came to legislate, the special committee could not report legislation on any phase of the problem. It would have to turn its report over to the standing committees; whereas if the investigation were made by the Committee on Banking and Currency, a large part of the field covered by the investigation could be handled within that committee.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot yield further. I have only another minute or two. Admitting that under the terms of the Tobey substitute, the Banking

and Currency Committee could go into the entire field of troubles afflicting small business, when it came to legislate it would, out of the mass of testimony and proposed legislation which it covered, sift out that which was necessary for legislation and report it to the Senate.

On the other hand, under the resolution we are now considering, assuming that the Committee on Small Business went into the same field, if it recommended certain legislation to the Senate, even if it recommended a bill or a dozen bills, they would then have to be referred to the standing committee having jurisdiction of the subject.

So, Mr. President, in the interest of efficiency, economy, and orderly legislation, it seems to me to be common sense to refer to the committee having jurisdiction of substantive legislation the investigation necessary to bring out the facts which will show what legislation is needed; for, in the absence of legislation, neither the Small Business Committee nor any other committee can for very long do any legislative business or any other kind of business, because we must give our attention to the law, and not to an effort to substitute a committee of Congress for an executive department, whether it be the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, or any other agency which deals with the financial set-up of business, whether it be large or small.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I have supported the substitute offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. If it be rejected, I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there are no other Senators to speak on our side of the question. Therefore, we request an immediate vote on the pending question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the announcement of the Senator from Nebraska, all time for both sides has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to Senate Resolution No. 20.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eaton	Lodge
Baldwin	Ellender	Lucas
Ball	Ferguson	McCarran
Barkley	Flanders	McCarthy
Brewster	Fulbright	McClellan
Bricker	George	McFarland
Bridges	Green	McGrath
Brooks	Gurney	McKellar
Buck	Hatch	McMahon
Bushfield	Hawkes	Magnuson
Butler	Hayden	Malone
Cain	Hickenlooper	Martin
Capehart	Hill	Maybank
Capper	Hoey	Millikin
Chavez	Holland	Moore
Connally	Ives	Morse
Cooper	Jenner	Murray
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Downey	Kem	O'Daniel
Dworschak	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Langer	Pepper

Reed	Stewart	Vandenberg
Revercomb	Taylor	Watkins
Robertson, Va.	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Robertson, Wyo.	Thomas, Utah	White
Russell	Thye	Wiley
Saltonstall	Tobey	Williams
Smith	Tydings	Young
Sparkman	Umstead	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to Senate Resolution No. 20. The Senate has agreed to vote upon the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments offered by Mr. WHERRY, as agreed to, are as follows:

On page 2, line 4, after the words "Eightieth Congress", insert "for a period of 240 days after the date this resolution is agreed to."

On page 2, line 19, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as of January 31, 1947: *Provided*, That the authority of such special committee to hold hearings and conduct investigations shall terminate on the date this resolution is agreed to."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to have the amendment read?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I shall appreciate having that done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. The special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 8, 1940, as extended and supplemented, shall give all its data and information to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness. I am informed that, if present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY (when Mr. TAFT's name was called). The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are paired on this vote. If the Senator from West Virginia were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea." If the Senator from Ohio were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Holland	Myers
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Langer	Pepper
Downey	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Eastland	McCarran	Russell
Ellender	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Taylor
George	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Umstead
Hoey	Morse	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Ecton	Murray
Ball	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Brewster	Flanders	Revercomb
Bricker	Gurney	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Smith
Buck	Ives	Stewart
Bushfield	Jenner	Thye
Butler	Kem	Vandenberg
Cain	Knowland	Watkins
Capehart	Lodge	Wherry
Capper	McCarthy	White
Cooper	Malone	Wiley
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Young
Dworshak	Moore	

NOT VOTING—7

Byrd	Reed	Wilson
Kilgore	Taft	
Overtone	Wagner	

So Mr. TOBEY's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness. If he were present he would vote "nay," and if

I were permitted to vote I should vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY (when Mr. TAFT's name was called). I announce the same pair between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], as announced on the last vote. If the Senator from Ohio were present and permitted to vote on this question he would vote "yea," and if the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] were present and permitted to vote he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—46

Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Ball	Flanders	Revercomb
Brewster	Gurney	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Stewart
Buck	Jenner	Thye
Bushfield	Kem	Vandenberg
Butler	Knowland	Watkins
Cain	Lodge	Wherry
Capehart	McCarthy	White
Capper	Malone	Wiley
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Young
Dworshak	Moore	
Ecton	Murray	

NAYS—42

Aiken	Hoey	Morse
Barkley	Holland	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cooper	Langer	Pepper
Downey	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Eastland	McCarran	Russell
Ellender	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Taylor
George	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Umstead

NOT VOTING—7

Byrd	Reed	Wilson
Kilgore	Taft	
Overtone	Wagner	

So the resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee consisting of 12 Senators, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress

in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress for a period of 240 days after the date of this resolution is agreed to, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. The special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 8, 1940, as extended and supplemented, is hereby terminated as of January 31, 1947: *Provided*, That the authority of such special committee to hold hearings and conduct investigations shall terminate on the date this resolution is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no legislative matter now ready for consideration by the Senate, and therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. I may say that upon the disposition of the business on the Executive Calendar I propose to move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce;

William Chapman Foster, of New York, to be the position of Under Secretary of Commerce;

Adrian S. Fisher, of Tennessee, to the position of Solicitor, Department of Commerce; Richard F. Mitchell, of Iowa, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1949, vice Claude R. Porter; and Clarence M. Young, of California, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1952 (reappointment).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frances Perkins to be Civil Service Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dillon S. Myer to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, with respect to the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, I suggest that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John O'Dea to be people's counsel, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if there is no further executive business, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senate has been regaled with a discussion of the manner in which our business has been conducted, with particular reference to the activities of the Senator from Maine and one or two others. I had the opportunity of looking at much of the material, and it seems to be primarily concerned with the discussion of the methods and the motives which prevailed in the consideration of the matter just disposed of.

The descent to a discussion of the motives of Senators immediately reduces the Senate to the scale of other bodies with which, in my judgment, we do not care to associate ourselves. So that for myself I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss the details of whether or not the motives of Senators are what they should be.

I do, however, want to read into the Record at this time what is my final and complete statement as to a descent of this character into the motive of Senators who come here presumably in the public interest and motivated on all sides by a desire to accomplish public good. Without arrogating to myself any resemblance to the distinguished citizen of America who uttered these words, even in a very minuscule manner, I should like to read them as expressing my attitude toward a discussion of motives, and what I hope and believe is the attitude of most of the other members of this body.

These are the words of Abraham Lincoln, when he was under considerable attack as to his motives:

If I were to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how, the very best I can, and I mean to keep on doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

With that I leave what I hope may be the end of the discussion of motives of Senators on either side of the aisle, and in the hope that we may go forward in the discussion of the public business without attributing to any Member of this body motives which are improper or low.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, previously during this debate I expressed myself about the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. I expressed the hope that that committee might continue. I expressed my own willingness to vote to give the committee additional authority which I thought the Senator from Maine had erroneously surrendered.

I do not know what the Senator means when he talks about motives. I certainly did not charge the Senator with any improper motives, but I am glad to say now—

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I certainly had no reference whatsoever to anything the Senator from New Mexico said. I heard much of the remarks of the Senator, and I appreciated very deeply the suggestion as to the broadening of the scope of our committee and its responsibility. There was not a word which I heard the Senator utter—and I was quite in accord with his attitude at all times on public business—that would indicate in any way that he questioned the motives of any Member of this body.

Mr. HATCH. Anyway, Mr. President, regardless of that—and I do not know what the Senator from Maine meant—I wish to make a statement now, because I desire the Senator's committee to be

strong; I desire it to be a good committee, and I am going to tell the Senator that the strength and the sinew of the Truman committee consisted in the complete nonpartisan approach which President Truman, then Senator Truman, gave to every problem that came before him.

I say very frankly to the Senator from Maine that when I heard here on the floor of the Senate for the first time the article published in the American magazine (sic) and read by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], an article which was based altogether upon an executive session of the committee, I thought the committee was stooping to party politics. I want to say further that when I also read that the Republican National Committee had released a so-called report which was given to it by the Senator from Maine 5 days before the election, and which had been prepared originally in 1942 by one investigator of the staff, and which had been rejected by the general counsel, Mr. Fulton, because it contained no factual data whatever, but was the mere opinion of the one investigator, and then later when a new general counsel was appointed, Mr. Halley, and the same investigator submitted the same inconclusive and unsupported report, Mr. Halley rejected it because it was not supported by factual data—when the Senator from Maine, through the Republican National Committee, then released that as a report of the committee, which had been suppressed—and that was the press statement—

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine will state the point of order.

Mr. WHITE. I make the point of order that in what the Senator from New Mexico is now saying, directed at my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine, he is indulging in a reflection on him, prohibited by the rules. I think he is challenging the motives and the purposes of my colleague, and I make the point that he is out of order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, is the point of order debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is not debatable.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I move that the Senator from New Mexico proceed in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is in order and is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico will proceed in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Maine. I am presently going to give some good advice. That is what I am leading up to.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the spirit in which the Senator from New Mexico always speaks.

I appreciate the interest of my colleague from Maine in his desire to protect what he felt were possibly my interests, and also his regard for the proprieties of this body; but while I might perhaps be more sensitive than anyone else, I am not prepared to challenge the Senator from New Mexico in what he has said.

I contemplated taking 2 or 3 minutes to answer what I felt was a very appropriate discussion by the Senator from New Mexico regarding the two episodes of which he speaks; but at this point I might say I think the suggestion that the publication in the *Liberty* magazine—I am sure the Senator from New Mexico does not wish to do an injustice to either *Liberty* or the *American* magazine—it was *Liberty*—

Mr. HATCH. Did I say *American* magazine?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator did.

Mr. HATCH. I meant *Liberty* magazine.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator will stand corrected. "*Liberty*" is a very good name.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it less American than the other one?

Mr. BREWSTER. The publication was in *Liberty*. I am not in the class with the Senator from Kentucky, as yet.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was merely asking whether that was less American than the other one.

Mr. BREWSTER. The publication in *Liberty* certainly had a political connotation, as the Senator from New Mexico properly says, it having appeared 1 week before the election. The only point that I should enter in my own behalf in the situation is that for the preceding 3 months, as I stated on the floor the other day, the material represented in the charges of a colonel in our Intelligence Service who had spent the last 2 years in Germany had, as I felt, been unjustly and improperly suppressed by the committee, of which I was a member, by a committee which in the four preceding years of its history had never had a divided report, either when the Senator from New Mexico or his successors were serving on it, and that for the first time last summer, in the feverish days of the campaign, with the chairman of our committee a candidate for Governor of the great State of New York, what seemed to me the ugly head of politics obtruded itself; the decisions of that committee were unfortunately being involved in the campaign; whereas, in the two preceding campaigns, while the committee was under the chairmanship of Senator Truman, we had never had a question of politics raised, but our committee had remained comparatively inactive for the 2 or 3 months immediately before an election.

It was to me a matter of profound regret that the committee should have had its standard to some extent trailing in the dust.

Mr. HATCH. That is right. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. BREWSTER. For my part in it, I am ready to take full responsibility. Whether or not I performed my duty as a Senator or as a citizen must remain for each one to determine. I am ready to accept the opprobrium which the Senator may cast upon me, but I say to him that it was the Senator's own colleagues on his side of the aisle who in my judgment first precipitated the issue, and that I delayed 3 months before I felt the people of the United States were entitled to know those charges which had been made.

As to the other item, the housing report, as the Senator, himself, has said, it had been on file with our committee in one instance for 3 years; in the other instance, for 1 year.

Meanwhile in the State of New York the former chairman of our committee, the candidate for governor on the Democratic ticket, was making the welkin ring with charges against the Governor of New York, forsooth, because he did not solve the housing problem. Unlike some of our associates, I have read the records of our committee, so I do not accept the statement of either the first general counsel of the committee or the second general counsel as to whether the reports in question were of a character entitled to consideration. From my own experience I was convinced that they contained material fully documented in accordance with the experience of our committee, which entitled them to consideration by the members of the committee, which, on the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, they had not yet received though they had been disapproved by the first counsel of the committee and by the second counsel of the committee. Forsooth, for what does our committee exist? Certainly for the members of the committee to act upon such reports. I have read those reports. They were documented. In the final analysis it seems to me that the people were entitled to know what the reports contained before they were compelled to listen further to what seemed to me to be the unwarranted and the unfounded charges of one who had so recently been the chairman of our committee, who spoke from a forum here in Washington throughout the early days of the campaign, with the Mead committee constantly the medium through which these campaign documents were released.

The Senator from New Mexico spoke of the Republican National Committee. I would rather take upon myself the garments of the Republican National Committee, if I were going to enter the political arena, than to clothe myself in the habiliments of the Truman and the Mead committee, which was the guise under which the chairman of that committee at that time was running for political office in the State of New York.

So forsooth, I released the housing report, and for it I have no apology in this forum or elsewhere.

I regret that politics entered our ranks. I hope that we may now go forward and continue the record made prior to the last 6 months in the great spirit of that committee under the chairmanship of the man who is now President of the United States. It will be my earnest en-

deavor, with the cooperation of those who may be associated with me upon either side, to restore, so far as possible, the splendid record which that committee made prior to the last 6 months.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was glad to yield to the Senator from Maine. I was very happy to give him the opportunity to make any explanation he might desire as to the reasons why he as a member of that committee wrote an article for a national publication, an article based upon facts which had not been verified, but which had only come to the committee by the unsupported testimony of one man, in executive session, information which the Senator from Maine heralded throughout the Nation as evidence that the Truman administration has failed.

Ah, Mr. President, the Senator may stand here on the floor of the Senate and make any explanation he desires, but I leave to him and to his own conscience the decision as to whether or not he injected party politics into the Truman committee.

Mr. President, I do not want anyone to charge me with being out of order, because as I stated in the beginning, what I rose to say was that the strength and sinew of the Truman committee had been its complete nonpartisanship. I served on it with the Senator from Maine and with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and we worked, I thought, with some degree of patriotism for the welfare of our country. Party politics did not enter into the question. I recall, as I look at the Senator from Michigan, that one time he and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] investigated an airplane factory in Ohio, and discovered methods of inspection which were so lax that motors were permitted to be installed in planes that carried our fighting men which were dangerous to the lives of those men. I recall that the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from West Virginia revealed those defects, which were almost criminal. I think that as a result of that work there are American boys at home now safe who might otherwise be resting in that last long sleep on foreign soil.

Mr. President, I am proud of the Truman committee. I am proud of my connection with it. I am proud of my work with the Republican members of it. I want that same attitude continued. I do not want partisan articles written for a national magazine. I do not want reports released through either the Republican National Committee or the Democratic National Committee. I rose to say to the new chairman that he has a great opportunity. The Senator from Maine has a chance to uncover fraud and corruption and wrongdoing wherever it exists, and be assured, sir, it will not be alone Democratic fraud, it will not be alone Democratic wrongdoing.

The only point I make is that I want a good job done. The Senator from

Maine does have the opportunity to do it. I do not mean this offensively, but if he, as chairman of the committee, will follow in the footsteps of the man who was the committee's first chairman, he will not go wrong.

Mr. President, it has been said here that the publicity and the headlines given to Harry Truman made him Vice President and resulted in his becoming President of the United States. I do not choose to look upon it in that light. Rather I would say, as a tribute to a conscientious public servant, that the fine, nonpartisan, courageous manner in which Senator Truman conducted the affairs of the committee was recognized by a grateful people, and they gave him a just reward and said to him "Well done, good and faithful servant."

I hope the new chairman will conduct himself in that spirit and in the same way.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico, and I shall certainly heed his advice, as I want to continue the character of service which our former colleague rendered throughout the period he served on that committee. It will be my highest hope that the committee, under its new membership, with the four Members who will be associated with me from the other side of the aisle, may be able to recapture and to justify the confidence of the Senate and the country.

I think we all realize that graft and corruption are thoroughly nonpartisan.

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM B. ZIFF, CO-CHAIRMAN OF NATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR A FREE PALESTINE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a press release by William B. Ziff, cochairman of the National Executive Board of the American League for a Free Palestine. Mr. Ziff is perhaps the outstanding expert in the entire United States on questions dealing with Palestine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have accepted the position of cochairman of the National Executive Board of the American League for a Free Palestine, in the belief that it affords me a very great opportunity to be of service to my fellow Americans and to the great cause of human freedom with which American world interests are directly related.

Mr. Truman, Mr. Byrnes, and all other spokesmen for our Republic have made it clear that we no longer can ignore unilateral acts of terror and despoliation imposed by force on small nations, and that the interests of our country demand an adherence to the principles of international law and international morality. The case of Palestine is a test case of these professions.

Hebrew Palestine is unique in the sense that it is the ward of all the nations. Under the assumption that international law existed, the charter for Hebrew Palestine was issued by unanimous agreement of 52 nations. These appointed one of their number, Great Britain, to be the guardian of Hebrew interests and to be responsible for an orderly repatriation of the dispossessed Hebrew people. American interests and consent were covered in a special treaty signed in 1922.

The object of the nations was to settle a terrible problem whose magnitude has since been shown in the mass murder of almost 8,000,000 Jews in Europe. Great Britain was instructed to facilitate the repatriation of the Hebrew people and their close settlement on the land of Palestine. Instead the emissaries of His Majesty's Government instituted a reign of terror in Palestine and made themselves a leading party to a gigantic conspiracy to nullify the very purposes for whose fulfillment Great Britain had been appointed.

Palestine is now the only nation in the world where officially promulgated anti-Semitic laws openly operate. Jews may be seized on the streets, shot, or exiled to concentration camps in far-away Africa without benefit of trial or even charge. A whole set of vicious regulations exist which deprive the Jewish population of basic human rights. Just as in the pale in Czarist Russia, because a man is a Jew he may not own or till land in his own country except in certain small, restricted areas. Looting and personal maltreatment by soldiers and police is an everyday occurrence.

The result was what might be expected. The answer to this terrorism was a counter-violence on the part of young patriots determined to remain free or die. In Palestine is being repeated all of the circumstances which a generation ago shook Ireland and which a century and a half ago resulted in the American Revolution. Just as the Irish and American resistance forces were libeled and traduced as terrorists, so are the young Hebrew patriots of Palestine.

It seems perfectly clear that the interests of America demand a pacification of the world based on an honest and honorable settlement of problems, and that the substitution of guns for law involves a frightening process which will one day inevitably involve the world in the most terrifying and destructive of all its wars.

There must now be an end to bloodshed and to the corruptions and terrors which proceed from oppression.

Each of the great British leaders has acknowledged for the record that the present British policy is dishonorable and violates fundamental law. Yet in an effort to justify this indefensible program, British officials are taking up where Hitler left off and are making themselves the spokesmen and organizers of world-wide anti-Semitic as well as anti-Zionist opinion.

No part of this grim situation may safely go unchallenged. The British rape of Palestine is no different in its relation to world peace than the German rape of Czechoslovakia. It is simply a case of cold greed and boundless ambition against the common rights and interests of humankind.

It is also a fact that any considered and sensible policy on the part of the United States demands the establishment in the Near and Middle East of a strong, industrialized republic built along western lines, whose self-interest compels an integration of its economy with the West. Otherwise the Near and Middle East will continue to function as a vacuum from which the West will ultimately be excluded.

The British will fail in this attempt to settle the Hebrew problem by means of Hitlerian force. The Hebrew patriots are certain to resist and to attempt to answer blow for blow. If, as has been threatened, the British attempt a massive campaign of suppression to crush Hebrew Palestine once and for all, there will be an equally massive reaction from the entire world of freemen. That is certain.

The economic and military weakness of present-day Britain is great, and may soon become desperate. Conscious of these facts, Britain is bending every energy to insure American sympathy and assistance, and is clamoring for morality in international relationships. In this respect the British must be reminded that they, too, must become

moral, and that the world no longer is capable of supporting the shock of such terroristic and lawless tactics as His Majesty's Government has substituted for law in the Holy Land.

DETERIORATION OF ARMY TRUCKS AND JEEPS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared this morning in the New York Times. It contains an interview with Maj. Gen. Everett S. Hughes, of the United States Army. The article is entitled "General Hughes Cites Big Deterioration of Army Ordnance."

Ever since my distinguished colleague [Mr. YOUNG] came to the Senate he and I have worked hard to obtain trucks for the farmers of the United States. We have submitted hundreds of letters from veterans who want jeeps. We have been told time and again that none were available. Yet we find a general stating that in one field in Ogden, Utah, thousands of trucks and jeeps are rotting.

I do not know what standing committee ought to have jurisdiction of this subject. Perhaps it ought to be the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that trucks and jeeps are rotting in Utah at the very time when the farmers and veterans of the United States desire trucks and jeeps.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL HUGHES CITES BIG DETERIORATION OF ARMY ORDNANCE—HE ASSERTS 20,000 VEHICLES ARE RUSTING AWAY AT SINGLE FIELD AT OGDEN, UTAH—FURTHER JUNKING IS URGED—CHIEF REPORTS A THIRD OF HIS BUDGET IS CONSUMED BY "CARETAKING" EXPENSES

(By Sidney Shalett)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Back from a 2-week field inspection during which he said he was shocked by the sight of 20,000 Army vehicles slowly rusting away at a single field, Maj. Gen. Everett S. Hughes, Army Chief of Ordnance, declared today he would urge a revision of plans for proper storage facilities, or junking of much matériel.

General Hughes stated that the Ordnance Department is unable, because of a lack of funds, warehouse facilities, and personnel, to give proper protection and maintenance to huge numbers of all types of vehicles.

At a time when it is vital to obtain the utmost value from every available dollar, General Hughes said he believed it imperative to subject the program for storage of reserve equipment to the closest scrutiny.

It is his personal conviction, he said, that quantities of the matériel being saved will be either obsolete before it can be used again or will go to ruin unless it is given better protection.

The general stated that he intends to suggest to Army Ground Forces that the reserve equipment requirements be reviewed and matériel that can be dispensed with be either sold as surplus or junked.

The 20,000 vehicles exposed to the elements are located at Ogden, Utah, General Hughes said. They included several thousand jeeps, trucks, some tanks, combat cars, and other types of vehicles.

General Hughes estimated that about one-third of the entire Ordnance Department budget was consumed by its "caretaker" responsibilities and still the job is not being properly done.

A proper program for storage of jeeps, for example, he stated, would be one which would guarantee that the vehicles would be immediately serviceable at any period. This would mean they should be under a roof and periodically inspected by maintenance men. Also that a replacement program for tires and batteries, which deteriorate with nonuse, be organized.

Ammunition storage is another serious problem, particularly since there is a safety problem involved. It can be preserved indefinitely, but not unless it is under cover. General Hughes said he is asking ground forces to indicate what they can do without, so we can get rid of the rest.

Army Ordnance has experimented with a program of "canning" certain ordnance items such as tanks and artillery—that is, placing them inside huge steel drums fitted with dehumidification equipment.

General Hughes said he is not convinced that this method is the best means of preservation. He favors storage in warehouses where the equipment can be periodically inspected.

Postwar ordnance studies have convinced General Hughes of the need for working out an industrial mobilization program which will keep the munitions industry in a standby basis so that, if war comes again, it will not be necessary for the industry to begin an all-out production grind. The danger of such a grind is that it consumes practically the entire effort of industry and leaves little time for development of new ideas and equipment, he said.

Unification of services will pose important problems to the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, such as deciding which ordnance facilities are to be scrapped in the consolidation, General Hughes said.

Bright spots in the ordnance picture, General Hughes declared, are the excellent progress being made in research through coordinated efforts of civilian scientists and Army ordnance experts, and the impressive cooperation of American industrialists.

CONDOLENCES TO FAMILIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE BYRD ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 58, tendering the condolences of the Senate to the families of certain members of the Byrd Antarctic Expedition killed in an airplane crash in the Antarctic was agreed to by the Senate on January 17 last. There appears an error in the name of one of the persons killed. The name is stated in the resolution as "Aviation Radioman Second Class Wendell Keith Henderson, of Portsmouth, Va." The name should be "Aviation Radioman First Class Wendell Keith Hendersin, of Portsmouth, Va."

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate Resolution 58 was agreed to be reconsidered, that it be amended as indicated, and that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the vote by which Senate Resolution 58 was agreed to on January 17 is reconsidered, the resolution is amended as indicated, and the resolution, as amended, is agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) as amended is as follows:

Whereas Ensign Maxwell Albert Lopez, of Newport, R. I.; Aviation Machinist's Mate

First Class Frederick Warren Williams, of Huntington, Tenn.; and Aviation Radioman First Class Wendell Keith Hendersin, of Portsmouth, Va., lost their lives in the crash of a plane while on a photographic mission of the Byrd Antarctic Expedition;

Whereas the deaths of these men were the first casualties of this historic expedition; and

Whereas they were engaged in scientific investigations and extraordinary aerial explorations the results of which may possibly prove of inestimable scientific value to the future of mankind and of great national importance to the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby tenders its condolences to the families of the deceased and expresses its gratitude for the heroic services of these men: And be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of each of the deceased.

POLITICAL GLAMOUR CONTEST

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, night before last, I believe, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made certain statements regarding Members of his party and Members of the Democratic Party concerning relative pulchritude. Today I received a telegram which I should like to read. I have been waiting for the senior Senator from Ohio to appear, but apparently he has been unwilling to subject himself to requests for the privilege of making a decision as to which of the ladies is most beautiful. I have considered that perhaps a special committee might be appointed to take jurisdiction of this question; but I should like to read the telegram into the RECORD at this time. It is addressed to me.

NEW YORK, N. Y. January 24, 1947.

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,

United States Senate:

The Swim for Health Association willing to provide neutral jury to conduct glamour contest between Democratic and Republican Members of the United States Senate. Will provide necessary trunks. Will furnish beach sweaters or coats for modest Members if necessary, will be happy to conduct beauty contest among wives of Senators, providing bathing suits or sweaters for event. Have just completed annual national swim for health week queen beauty contest at Miami Beach. Please wire if you need assistance.

MARTIN STERN,

Executive Director, Swim for Health Association.

The question which I wish to submit to the senior Senator from Ohio was whether or not he proposed to decide this question by a party vote following a caucus, or whether he was willing to leave it to a neutral body, as suggested by the telegram. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the Senator received any information from the Senator from Ohio as to whether he intends to enter the swimming contest or the beauty contest? [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the consent of the Senator from Ohio to announce this pair, but I wish to announce that in the beauty contest the senior

Senator from Florida is paired with the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will announce that that pair is a tie. [Laughter.]

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I announce that open hearings on the question of the confirmation of the Presidential nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission, as well as that of the General Manager of that Commission, will begin on Monday next at 10:30 o'clock a. m. The first meeting will be held in the meeting room of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and the first witness will be Mr. David E. Lilienthal, who has been designated as Chairman of the Commission. Members of the Senate who have any pertinent information they would like to present, or who are interested in attending, are invited to be present and submit their information.

ANTILABOR LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on January 9 of this year Mr. Robert W. Ruhl, editor of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune, a newspaper in my State, published an editorial. Mr. Ruhl is recognized, not only in my State but throughout the Nation, as a brilliant editor, and one who has always been very friendly to the best interests of the Republican Party. The editorial which he wrote I think contains some very good advice to my party on the subject of labor legislation. The title of the editorial is "Political Suicide." I find myself in such complete agreement with the advice to my party which this great editor has given to it in this editorial that I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL SUICIDE

If the Republican Party wishes to commit political suicide, they have only to pass the Ball bill to do it.

This measure would prohibit both the closed and the union shop throughout the country.

We doubt if such a law would be constitutional. But if it did pass the courts it would not be workable.

And politically, as stated, it would be suicidal.

We venture to say it would not gain one vote for the GOP. Those who want a labor prohibition law of that type are mostly Republicans anyway.

Not only organized labor, but practically all labor, and a vast majority of liberal and independent voters would vote against any party seriously advocating such a measure.

We can't believe Republican leadership at Washington could be so foolhardy and so stupid as to endorse the passage of such radical antilabor legislation at this time. But perhaps it is.

If so, it is doomed to defeat 2 years hence, and will richly deserve it.

R. W. R.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 27, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 15), 1947:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harvey Erickson, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington, vice Edward M. Connelly, resigned.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Elliott Northcott 2d to be an ensign in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 5th day of December 1946.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 15), 1947:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Frances Perkins to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

John O'Dea to be people's counsel, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, before whom all our pretenses fall away, who knowest our secret thoughts and our hidden fears, bless us this day with Thy Spirit and help us to discharge our duties faithfully and well. Ever sensitive to the hurting of our own feelings, may we be sensitive also to our grieving of Thy Holy Spirit when we give ourselves to the lesser loyalties and spend our time and our energies in that which is less than the highest and the best.

We pray for the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, the representatives of the people, the judges of the land, and all those in authority, that it may please Thee so to rule their hearts that they may rightly use the trust committed to them for the good of all people.

Raise up among us, we pray Thee, fearless men who know that only in the doing of Thy will can we find our peace. So make it plain to us this day, and give us the courage to do it. All this we beg for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, January 24, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PROPOSED REFERENCE OF BILL CREATING A SINGLE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. When the President's message on the establishment of a single Department of National Defense was received, it was referred by the Chair to the Committee on Armed Services. The Chair is in receipt of a letter from the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], submitted on behalf of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which he is chairman, insisting that when the merger bill arrives it will belong in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The Chair wishes to state that this is one of those cases in which reference can be justified in either direction, and the final decision should be made by the Senate itself, inasmuch as it is a matter of policy.

Therefore the Chair is asking that the letter of the Senator from Vermont be printed in the RECORD, and the Chair is announcing that when the merger bill arrives and is introduced the Chair will be prepared to rule in open session, so that the Senate will have an opportunity to dissent from the decision of the Chair if it disagrees.

There being no objection, the letter of Mr. AIKEN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 23, 1947.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At a meeting of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held this morning, there was considerable discussion regarding the jurisdiction of the committee, particularly with respect to bills relating to "reorganization of the executive branch of the Government," which, according to the provisions of section 102 (1) (g) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), are to be referred to this committee.

It was noted that on Monday of this week the President's message on the establishment of a single Department of National Defense was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, while on the House side this communication was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The 11 committee members who were present this morning were unanimously of the opinion that their committee should have jurisdiction, under the statute, of any bill that may be introduced to carry out the President's proposals, and felt that the existence of this sentiment on the part of the committee should be made known before such a bill is presented. I am, therefore, taking this means of bringing the matter to your attention.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that under the law two Members of the Senate are required to be appointed to act in connection with the committee of the House of Representatives in the matter of the dis-

position of useless executive papers, as recommended by the Archivist of the United States. The Archivist has transmitted three such reports to the Congress, and the Chair appoints as such committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who are the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Civil Service, which has jurisdiction over the National Archives.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement as to the program. The Senate will have a morning hour and at the conclusion of the morning hour will automatically proceed to a call of the calendar. Then there are some nominations which ought to be disposed of; and when the call of the calendar has been concluded, I shall ask that there be an executive session for the disposition of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Chair suggests that the Senator from Connecticut notified the Senate on Friday last that he would speak today at the conclusion of the call of the calendar.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSFER OF VESSEL TO UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Navy Department will endeavor to locate and transfer a Diesel-propelled coastal transport for use by the University of Washington, a tax-supported nonprofit institution of the State of Washington, located at Seattle, Wash., to be used in oceanographic research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX, AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

AQUEDUCT NEAR SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the construction of an aqueduct near San Diego, Calif., under a contract executed by the Navy Department with the city of San Diego, and stating "The report indicates the reasons why this contract and expenditures of Federal funds pursuant thereto are considered to be in violation of law" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

GERALD E. PHILLIPS ET AL.

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Gerald E. Phillips, David C. Watson, and Mrs. Mildred Kobylak (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh annual report of